


BT
990
.H379
v.2



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

THE
HISTORY AND THEOLOGY
OF
THE THREE CREEDS.

BY THE
REV. WILLIAM WIGAN HARVEY, M.A.,
LATE FELLOW OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE;
RECTOR OF BUCKLAND, HERTS.

VOLUME II.

LONDON: JOHN W. PARKER AND SON.
CAMBRIDGE: JOHN DEIGHTON.

1854.



Cambridge:
Printed at the University Press.

THE THEOLOGY

OF

THE CREEDS.

THE preceding Article of our Lord's descent into Hell results naturally from faith in the human nature of Christ; the present rests upon testimony that is purely historical. And there is no antecedent presumption that can make it incredible; for as an act of Might, the Resurrection is in no way more marvellous than the creation of the first Adam in the beginning. It was always a matter of traditional faith in the Jewish Church; and our Lord rebuked the Sadducees for abandoning their ancestral belief. 'But as touching the Resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' The well-known passage also, in the book of Maccabees, proves very conclusively that the popular faith was clear and decided, as regards the resurrection of the just. The seven brethren, whom Antiochus put to death, asserted their belief of a resurrection with a constancy, that the most fearful tortures could not shake. 'The

Jewish belief in a Resurrection.

Matt. xxii.
31, 32.

2 Macc. vii. 9.

Jewish belief in a Resurrection.

King of the world shall raise us up, who have died for his laws, unto everlasting life.' The seventh also confirmed the faith of the six brethren, whose mangled bodies lay before his eyes; 'Our brethren who now have suffered a short pain, are dead under God's covenant of everlasting life¹.'

Manifestly, therefore, the doctrine of the Resurrection was not antecedently incredible to the Jewish mind. In fact, St Paul appealed at once to the reason of Agrippa, as that which was competent to decide the point; 'Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?' That the body should rise again from the dust of the earth, may appear hereafter as natural a result, as that it should rise daily from its period of natural rest; but in the mean time, any single case in anticipation of the general resurrection is so wholly contrary to our present experience, that no greater miracle could be vouchsafed in evidence of the truth of a divine

¹ The same book of uncanonical Scripture gives evidence, that the prayers for the dead offered up in the Church of Rome were not unknown to the Jews. For Judas Maccabæus after one of his victories, made a collection throughout the company, and 'he sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin offering, doing therein very well and honestly, in that he was mindful of the resurrection: For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. And also in that he perceived that there was great favour laid up for

those that died godly, it was an holy and good thought. Whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin.' We find no trace whatever of such notions in the canonical Scriptures written before the captivity; it is probable, therefore, that prayer for the dead is a doctrinal link that serves to connect Rome with ancient Babylon. The Book of Esdras again affords evidence of a confident hope of the Resurrection; 'Wheresoever thou findest the dead, take them and bury them, and I will give thee the first place in my resurrection.'

revelation to man; and such a sign, when wrought by the operation of God, we may be sure would be supported by facts that would be wholly incontrovertible. The Resurrection of our Lord and Saviour was amply attested by such facts, and the eye-witnesses suffered death rather than deny them.

Historical
proofs.

First then the publicity that our Lord gave to the assurance, that he must rise again the third day after his death, is wholly inconsistent with any other idea than that of a true Resurrection, as it is recorded in the Gospels. Our Lord repeatedly declared to his disciples that he would rise again the third day. In the very outset also of his ministry, he announced the same event to the Jews in figurative language; 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up;' when the Evangelist adds, 'But he spake of the Temple of his Body.' His enemies however did not forget the saying; for it was made a matter of accusation against him before Caiaphas, and of taunt as he hung upon the cross; while after his death, as we have already seen, the Jews requested of the Roman Governor, that a watch might be set over the sepulchre in which his body was laid; for 'we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again.' Nothing therefore can be clearer, than that the Jews were cognisant of our Lord's declaration, that he would rise again, and on the third day; and they did all in their power to frustrate any collusory attempt, on the part of his disciples, to give the semblance of verification to his words.

John ii. 19,
21.

Matt. xxvi.
61; xxvii. 40,
63, 64.

Historical
proofs.

Col. ii. 15.

Matt. xxviii.
12, 13.

Mark xvi. 3.

Matt. xxvi.
56.

John xx. 19.

Other evidence of the Resurrection is manifold and complete. The chief priests and rulers of the Jews bore testimony to the fact. Christ having risen from the dead, 'spoiled principalities and powers, and made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in His own person.' For when they had heard all that had been done on the morning of the Resurrection at the tomb of Calvary, they summoned the assembly, and took counsel; whereby they became the first unconscious witnesses to the truth of the Resurrection; and they gave large money to the soldiers, saying, 'Say ye, His disciples came by night and stole him away while we slept.' With this idle tale they hoped to defeat the eternal purposes of God. The fabrication was idle, because it is impossible to imagine that while four soldiers were slumbering at their post, a stone, that was too heavy for the united strength of three women to move, should have been rolled aside without rousing the sleeping guard; and that the dead body should have been removed from the sepulchre by a party of the disciples, with so little sound of voice or foot as not to betray the act. It was idle, for the disciples had forsaken the Lord and fled, and a deed, that required no common amount of courage and daring, was ascribed to men who were so broken in spirit and lost to hope, that when they began to rally after the resurrection of the Lord, and to meet together, still it was 'with closed doors, for fear of the Jews.' It was hardly in this spirit that they could have gone forth at the dead of night,

through a city thronged with paschal devotees, and braved the danger of a certain collision with four armed and reckless soldiers, whom they knew to be faithfully watching over their trust. It was idle, again, because from the dawn of day the attention of a whole population must have been turned upon these few men by the marvellous story; and what hope could they have had of effectually concealing the stolen body, or of guarding against its production in evidence of their deed? It was idle, again, because the Roman Governor, Pilate, could not fail to hear of an event, that had been discussed by a special meeting of the Sanhedrim, and had become a matter of public notoriety in a city filled with his agents and emissaries. The very statement whereby the Jews attempted to account for the grave despoiled of its tenant, if it had been less a fiction, would have involved the necessity of a public enquiry, and a public example. The four soldiers would have been amenable to punishment for their remissness, and the disciples, for their daring crime against the majesty of the Roman laws. Whether or no the rulers persuaded the Roman Governor and secured the soldiery we know not; but we do know, that the disciples were never taxed with the offence by Pilate; they never attempted to secrete themselves, nor to escape home to the rocky shores of the Lake of Gennesareth. They remained for a week at least, where guilty men would never have been found, at Jerusalem. But it is needless to multiply reasons to shew the infatuation and want

Historical
proofs.

John xx. 26.

Synthetical account. of common forethought in the Jewish council, when they put their money into the hands, and this self-convicting falsehood into the mouths, of the Roman soldiers; truly it was an 'open triumph' that they were giving to the Christian cause.

Upon the first day of the week, therefore, before the dawn of day, the three women who had stood by, and assisted Nicodemus and Joseph in the pious office of laying our Lord's body in the tomb, returned, bringing the spices which they had prepared. 'And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away: for it was very great.' 'And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus.' But while they were perplexed thereabout, 'behold two men stood by them in shining garments: And as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. And they remembered his words.' They returned back therefore to the city and told Peter and John, 'They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him. Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre.' The linen clothes were there, such as were used in burying the dead. So Lazarus had come forth

Luke xxiv. 1.

Mark xvi. 3, 4.

Luke xxiv. 3-8.

John xx. 2, 3.

swathed hand and foot with grave-clothes, and his face was bound round about with a napkin. And such were the linen clothes that St John testifies to have seen in the sepulchre, 'and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself.' But the risen Lord did not vouchsafe to appear to them; 'Him they saw not;' and they went away again unto their own home. Mary Magdalene, however, returned to the sepulchre, and 'stood without weeping, and as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre, and seeth two angels in white, sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him. And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master. Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God. Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken

Synthetical
account.

John xi. 44.

John xx. 7.

Luke xxiv. 24.

John xx.

10, 11.

Luke xvi. 9.

John xx.

11-18.

Synthetical these things unto her.' 'Touch me not, for I am
 account. not yet ascended to my Father,' not yet is the
 whole counsel of Redemption complete; I must
 depart in the body that I may return in the spirit.
 Deep as thy repentance is, and true as thy love, it
 is not so that I can fill thy heart. But I go to my
 Father, and then at length I will make myself
 known to thee, as the power of God, and the
 Wisdom of God, to every soul that believeth. To
 Mary Magdalene, therefore, the first appearance of
 the risen Lord was vouchsafed; afterwards he was
 seen of the other women; then of the two dis-
 ciples on the way to Emmaus; next by St Peter;
 then by the ten Apostles in the absence of Thomas.
 Our Lord appeared upon these several occasions
 on the day of the Resurrection. And after eight
 days he was seen by the entire body of the Apo-
 stles, 'then of five hundred brethren at once.' At
 a later date, when they had departed into Galilee,
 he appeared to seven of the disciples on the shore
 of the sea of Galilee, among whom was James;
 then to the eleven in the mountain of Galilee,
 where the commission to baptize was formally
 given; then again when they sat at meat, on their
 return from Galilee, 'when he led them out as far
 as Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed
 them. And it came to pass, while he blessed
 them, he was parted from them, and carried up
 into heaven.' Upon these occasions at least, Christ
 vouchsafed to shew himself after the resurrection
 by many infallible proofs, 'to witnesses chosen be-
 fore of God; and conveyed to the Apostles, a

John xx. 14.
Mark xvi. 9.

Matt. xxviii.
9.
Luke xxiv.
13.
Mark xvi. 12.
Luke xxiv.
34.

John xx. 24,
26.

1 Cor. xv. 6.

John xxi. 1.

1 Cor. xv. 7.

Matt. xxviii.
17.

Luke xxiv.
50, 51.

saving knowledge of the doctrines that they were to preach. Possibly also, since these occasions are dispersed throughout the four Gospels, and none of the Evangelists gives a systematic account of these privileged visits to the disciples, He may have appeared to them much oftener. The words of St Paul to the Corinthians, though apparently the closest account of the various manifestations made by the risen Lord to his disciples, makes in fact several omissions; and his design doubtless was to instance only the particular cases that were most likely to weigh with those to whom he was addressing himself: such as the appearances to Peter, and James; twice to the eleven; and once to the five hundred brethren; the greater part of whom were still alive when St Paul wrote after the lapse of a quarter of a century; and lastly to himself, the founder of their Church. The words of St Luke certainly imply that these interviews were frequent.

We have a cloud of witnesses, therefore, to the historical fact of our Lord's Resurrection, and their faithfulness won for many of them the martyr's crown. But we must not forget that the Sanhedrim by whom the soldiers were bribed, contained in their number two persons, who after the burial of our Lord must be considered to be open disciples of the crucified Jesus. Nicodemus, 'a ruler of the Jews,' 'a master in Israel,' and one of the number of the chief priests, who sent officers to take Jesus at the feast of tabernacles in the autumn preceding the Crucifixion; and Joseph of Arimathea, an honourable man, and a counsellor,

Synthetical
account.

1 Cor. xv.

Acts i. 3.

John xix. 38,
39.

John iii. 1,
10.

John vii. 32,
50.

Joseph and
Nicodemus.

Luke xxiii.
51.
1 Cor. i. 26.

‘who also waited for the kingdom of God.’ If among the main body of disciples there were ‘not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble,’ here at least were two men, eminent for learning as for sanctity; wise in all that the Pharisees deemed wisdom, and competent judges, whether or no the marks and notes of the Messiah were satisfied in Christ; ‘mighty’ were they by reason of their station in society, and ‘noble’ in their birth; and therefore of all things it was the least likely, that they should identify themselves recklessly with principles, deemed by their colleagues to be subversive of all that was venerable and divine in the Mosaic system; or that they should help to build up upon its ruins a religion propounded by a few obscure Galilean fishermen. They were men of truth, however, amid a world of prejudice. If ever they had been blind to the same degree as were others of their station, the miracles of mercy that Christ performed, and above all the spiritual beauty and Godlike wisdom of every deed and word of his, had effectually dispelled the darkness. They could only feel as one of them had from the first confessed; ‘We know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.’

John iii. 2.

In a worldly point of view, the position of these men during the whole of this Paschal Sabbath must have been eminently trying. One of them had shrunk in confusion from the searching question, ‘Art thou also of Galilee? Search and look,

John vii. 52.

for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet ;' but now he stood committed to an overt act of discipleship, from which the more constant followers of Jesus had recoiled ; for he had assisted Joseph in laying the body of the Crucified in the tomb. Is it possible for the mind to imagine the taunts of hatred to which they were subjected, or the more difficult trial of advice and remonstrance on the part of friends ? Yet they must have foreseen the trial, and deliberately adopted every consequence of their act, in befriending the cause of Jesus in its very lowest state of depression. We know not indeed whether their faith was supported through the trial, for history is silent with respect to the subsequent life of these remarkable characters ; or rather the absence of any true account has given rise to a mythical use of their names ; so that a false gospel, identical perhaps with the spurious Acts of Pilate, is ascribed to Nicodemus ; while Joseph is stated to have preached the Gospel in Britain, having been sent on this mission with twelve others by St Philip. But the moral proof afforded by their conduct to the truth of the Christian History up to the Resurrection is strong. A single eye for the truth is manifest in their whole conduct. No ambition of placing themselves at the head of the followers of Jesus could have actuated them, because we hear no more of their names, although the new religion made daily progress, and even a great company of the priests were among the first-fruits of the Gospel in Jerusalem ; if therefore a desire for pre-eminence had been felt, the

Joseph and
Nicodemus.

Acts vi. 7.

Joseph and
Nicodemus.

means for its gratification were ample. The only reason that can be given, for the unflinching practical testimony that they rendered to the purity of the Christian cause, was, that they believed that it really was pure and true, and that the life of Christ was a manifestation of the Power of God. In the face, therefore, of the Resurrection, and of the account laid before the Sanhedrim on the first day of the week, and of the fiction published by authority to account for the disappearance of the body entombed by these two co-assessors in the council, it is utterly incredible that they should have gone back from the faith, and have allowed the fear of man now to step in and cause them to deny the Lord, whom by the soldiers' evidence they knew to have been raised by the Power of God. 'Behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men.'

Matt. xxviii.
2-4.

With what feelings must this testimony of the soldiers to the Resurrection have been received by Joseph and Nicodemus? Doubting? or with firm faith that the power of God, that they believed to have been manifested in Jesus during life, had raised him from the grave, according to his own often-repeated assurance? Far more likely is it that their names were found among those possessors of houses and lands, who 'sold them and

Acts iv. 34.

brought the price' to the Apostles' feet, and that from all eternity their names have been written in the Book of Life. But in any case the moral proof they give of the truth of the Christian History, up to the great fact of the Resurrection, is very strong. Their conduct proves that the Saviour was all that the Gospels reveal to us; just as the self-destruction of Judas in an agony of remorse, is a proof that the master whom he betrayed was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners. For had he not been the perfect character represented to us in the Gospels, the traitor would have felt little compunction for his act of treachery; Satan would hardly have had the power to drive him to the deed of despair; 'I have sinned,' he said, 'in that I have betrayed the innocent blood;' but he spoke of absolute innocence, and not of freedom from any particular charge; and the testimony that he spoke the truth was, that he 'went and hanged himself.' Sincere therefore and genuine was the conviction of the two holy characters who laid Jesus in the tomb. Whatever their more obdurate countrymen might think, to them the miracles of Christ were no deception of the people. The agency by which they were wrought was clearly that of God. For God is merciful, and full of compassion, true also and just; and these attributes shone bright as sun-beams upon the works and in the words of might that they had witnessed and heard. How then could he be a deceiver, or how could the Resurrection be any thing but the clear fulfilment of his words? Or

Witnesses
of the Re-
surrection.

Heb. vii. 26.

Matt. xxvii.
4.

Matt. xxvii.
5.

Witnesses
of the Re-
surrection.

Barrow,
Serm. xxix.
14.

can we fail to extend to the Resurrection, the testimony borne by these two enlightened and well educated men to every preceding part of Christ's History? Barrow's observation, in speaking of the credibility of the Christian witnesses of the Resurrection, applies with full weight to these two Jewish rulers; 'He who doubts of the sincerity of these witnesses, or rejects their testimony as incredible, must instead of it admit of divers stranger incredibilities; refusing his faith to one fact, devious from the natural course of things, but very feasible to God; he must thence allow it to many others, repugnant to the nature of Man and to the course of human things; performed without God, yea against him.'

Acts x. 41.

The Resurrection was announced to the Jewish council by the soldiers, before whose very eyes the tomb was burst open with an earthquake, and the quickened body of the Lord arose; and to the whole world, by the numerous 'witnesses chosen before of God, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.' These were eye-witnesses to the fact. Others gave a testimony scarcely less strong in their firm conviction of the truth and credibility of these witnesses. Such as the Jewish counsel, who glossed over with a falsehood the truth of a statement they could not deny; but which, if it had not been the truth, they might have instantly disproved and convicted of deceit. Joseph and Nicodemus also are antecedent witnesses to the truth of the Gospel History up to the very eve of the Resurrection, and if the equal

miracles of the raising of the widow's son, and the daughter of Jairus, and of Lazarus, under the very walls of Jerusalem, were believed by these men of station and dignity; the fact of our Lord's Resurrection rested upon no weaker ground, and it was impossible for them to have resisted a conviction of its truth, in whatever way they acted upon it. Similar considerations had thoroughly convinced the main body of disciples who were witnesses of the Resurrection. They had given up all to follow Christ. The truth on many occasions was forced home upon them, that Christ read the thoughts of their hearts, as plainly as they could see the deeds of mercy that he wrought; the power of God was visible in the miracles that he performed; and they were seen to be of God, and God alone, from the mercy and loving-kindness that were the impulsive cause of the performance of those deeds of wonder. They could not doubt therefore that God was in Christ. The display of might was worthy of God; and viewed in a moral aspect it could only be of God. When however by a yet more stupendous act of power, Christ, by his own inherent Godhead, burst the barriers of the tomb, and arose as a mighty conqueror over Death and Hell, they could but confess, The Lord is risen indeed. At first the Majesty of the deed blinded the disciples, and they doubted, but their doubts serve only to confirm the truth, because they were so wholly natural. The avowal of doubt is wholly inconsistent with the idea of imposition. Afterwards, when the truth had been

Witnesses
of the Re-
surrection.

Matt. xxviii.
17.
John xx. 25.

Witnesses
of the Re-
surrection.

confirmed beyond the power of the world or Satan to shake, by the repeated manifestations of the risen Lord, and above all by the power where-with they were endued from on high, by the descent of the Holy Ghost, we find them preaching the doctrine of the Resurrection with all boldness. In the sequel also they submitted to a life of suffering, and in many cases to a death of torture, rather than deny the truth that their own eyes had witnessed, or forego the eternal weight of glory to which their light afflictions for a time were the sure prelude. 'Thus, after so great humiliation, Christ manifested at length his glory, glorifying together with himself those that humble themselves with him. Of whom the chief are the blessed disciples, who visited the whole earth, poor and naked; not in wisdom of word, not with a vast retinue, alone, wandering, and desolate, suffering the vicissitudes of sea and land; scourged, stoned, persecuted, and in the end slain. These are ensamples to us of paternal and divine instruction¹' The certain evidence possessed by them that 'the Lord was risen indeed,' was that which by God's grace was their support throughout a whole life of trial, and the consistent course of action adopted by them upon that conviction, is the sure proof to us of their sincerity.

¹ Καὶ μετὰ τοσαύτην ταπεινω-
φροσύνην ὑπερὸν τὴν δόξαν ἐκ-
φαίνει, συνδοξάζων ἑαυτῷ τοὺς
συναδοξήσαντας· ὧν οἱ μακάριοι
μαθηταὶ πρῶτοι, πένητες καὶ γυμ-
νοὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην διαδραμόντες,
οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγον, οὐκ ἐν ἀκολού-

θων πλήθει, μόνοι καὶ ἀλῆται καὶ
ἔρημοι γῆν τε καὶ θάλατταν ἐξα-
μείβοντες· μαστιζόμενοι, λιθοβο-
λούμενοι, διωκόμενοι, τέλος ἀναι-
ρούμενοι. ταῦτα ἡμῖν πατρῶα καὶ
θεῖα παιδεύματα. Basil. de Humil.
6. Vind. Ca'h. II. 245.

Lastly, as every other particular of our Lord's Prophecy. person and mission, as mentioned in the Creed, was shewn forth by the Holy Spirit before he came in the flesh; so also God declared by his Holy Prophet, King David, that the death of Christ should involve no organic change or dissolution in his Body, neither should his Soul be separated from it for any length of time. 'Whom God hath Acts ii. 24. raised up, having loosed the 'pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.' And it was not possible, not because there was any thing in the body of Christ different from our mortal nature, that secured it from corruption; but it was not possible, because God had declared that Christ should so be raised; and the Scripture must be fulfilled, which said, 'Therefore did Acts ii. 26, 27. my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.' 'Because the worm and corruption hath no power over him,' says the ancient Hebrew gloss².

¹ Pains, חֲבָלִי Ps. xvii. 5, or 'bonds;' for as 'torqueo,' means first to twist and reeve a rope, and then, to torture; by a like analogy the Hebrew verb חָבַל bears the same primary and secondary meanings, and the derivative noun חֶבֶל signifies either 'pains' or 'bonds,' according to its punctuation.

² שלא בו רמה ותולעה *Midrash Tehillim, in loc.* The same commentary gives an interpretation to the term 'Holy One,' that is

singularly appropriate to Christ. 'Every one that heareth curses against himself and is silent, is (חֲסִיד) holy; but David heard curses against himself and was silent, and it is on this account that he is called, חֲסִיד.' What more suitable term can be applied to him, who was 'brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth.' 'Who when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not.' בל

Practical
considera-
tions.

And this doctrine of our Lord's Resurrection was destined to have a deep spiritual influence. That it is the cardinal point of our New Birth by the Spirit of Holiness, is the very voice of Scripture. The laver of regeneration is the image to each Christian soul of the Lord's Burial and Resurrection, 'We are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.' 'Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.' 'If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also

Rom. vi. 4.

Col. ii. 12.

Rom. viii. 11.

מי ששמע קללתו ושותק
נקרא חסיד ווד שמע קללתו
ושתק ובדין הוא שיקרא
חסיד

The interpretation of another passage in the Psalms (xxx. 5), is worthy of notice. 'R. Moses Hadarsan says that the text, "His anger endureth but a moment; in his favour is life," applies to the Messiah our Righteousness; for death shall be but for a moment, and life is in his good pleasure, to give to others, and for him to take it unto himself. Of kindred meaning to this are the next words; ("weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning") for when he inflicts death on any man, mourning is made for him; but if he recal to life, there is joy. And if he himself dies, all the followers of his name mourn, and when

he returns to life they rejoice.' In the same way it is said by Hosea, 'After two days will he revive us; in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight.' (Mechilta).

אמר ר' מ' הדרשן
כי רגע באפו חיים ברצונו
נאמר על משיח צדקנו כי
יהיה ברגע המות והחיים
ברצונו לתת לאחרים ולקבלה
הוא לעצמו וסמך ליה רנה'
כי כשיתן המיתה לשום אדם
ויבכו בעדו ובשיחיה אותו
ירננו והוא בשימות יתאבלו
כל רדפי שמו ובשיחיה ירננו
ונסמך לזה יחינו מימים ביום
השלישי יקמנו ונחיה לפניו

quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.' 'If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things that are above.' 'He was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification.'

Practical
considera-
tions.

Rom. iv. 25.
Col. iii. 1.
See also
1 Cor. vi. 14.
2 Cor. xiii. 4.
Eph. ii. 5, 6.

Further, the Resurrection of our Lord from the dead is one mighty proof that Christ is the Son of God. And since he is the first-born among many brethren, it is the Resurrection of our Lord also that confers upon us the adoption of sons. Hence St Peter interprets the second Psalm as exhibiting the proof of our Lord's Sonship, that resulted from his humiliation under the hand of man. 'The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed.' 'For of a truth,' said the Apostle, 'against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.' But this unworthy treatment of God's anointed, only led to the fullest manifestation of the paternal relation in which God the Father stood to the Human as to the Divine Nature of Christ, and which could not be realised before the death of Christ. For the Son of God had subsisted eternally in the Glory of the Father; the human nature of Christ had its commencement in time; and it was only through the gate of death, that the everlasting doors of Heaven could be passed, or the King of Glory could take full possession of his

Psal. ii. 2.

Acts iv. 27,
28.

Practical
considera-
tions.

Psal. ii. 6, 7.

Kingdom. Therefore in the Psalm, after the furious rage of the princes of the world against Christ had been described, the Holy Spirit adds that it led to the glorification of the human nature of Christ with the Father. ‘Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion.’ ‘I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.’

Since then the human nature of our Lord was admitted by means of the Resurrection to the throne of glory that awaited him upon his Ascension to the right hand of God, and was made heir by actual fruition of the fullest majesty and glory of God the Father; our human nature is also sanctified by the same means. If Christ rose from the dead in the body, we must rise with him in the spirit; as he from thenceforth had done with earth, we must cast off every hidden act of dishonesty, and be made new men in him, quickened by the Spirit of Him who raised up Jesus from the dead. It is only when the doctrine becomes in this way a living truth in our own souls, that Christ vouchsafes to call us his brethren; it is only as we are assimilated to the likeness of God, by a true renewal of the inner man, that we are his children. The old man is crucified and dead; the new man is raised up within by the spirit of holiness.

On the
third day.

One more particular remains to be noticed; the duration of our Lord's entombment. Our Lord rose on the first day of the week, and was put to death on the *παρασκευῇ*, or day before the

Jewish Sabbath; that is, on the sixth day; and during the intermediate period, his body remained in the tomb, separate from the soul. He lay under the hand of death therefore for part of the first day, part also of the third, and for the whole of the second; and, accordingly, his Resurrection was on the third day, and no other. For this was the known mode of computing among the Jews. When a child was born, any unexpired portion of the day of birth, however short, was reckoned as an entire day, and circumcision was performed on the eighth; i. e. upon that day week. But our Lord's statement, that 'as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth,' would seem to require that the period of entombment should extend over the whole period of three days and three nights; whereas it is certain that our Lord lay buried only during two nights; having risen before the dawn of the third day. The request of the Jews that the sepulchre might be sealed and a watch set 'until the third day,' is quite inconsistent with a literal acceptance of the period of three days and three nights, mentioned in the book of the prophet Jonas. To have covered that space of time, their watch must have been continued until the fourth day. But they well understood our Lord's expression, and their words marked the meaning attached by them to his saying, that 'after three days,' he would rise again. Augustine offers the following explanation of that, which is after all no

Jewish
Triduum.

Matt. xii. 40.

Matt. xxvi.
62.

Jewish
Triduum.

real difficulty; he says, 'By this mode of speaking, whereby the whole is indicated by a part, the question also concerning the resurrection of Christ is solved. For unless the latter portion of the day in which he suffered be taken for the whole day, that is, inclusive of the night past; and unless the night, at the conclusion of which he rose again, be considered to mean the whole day; namely, inclusive of the Lord's day then dawning; we cannot make out the three days and the three nights, during which he said that he must continue in the heart of the earth¹.' And this explanation is quite agreeable to the Hebrew mode of computing the natural period of a day: 'The evening and the morning were the first day.' In the same way the passage in Daniel translated 'days,' in the Chaldaic is, two thousand three hundred 'evenmorns².'

Dan. viii. 14.

1 Sam. xxx.
12, 13.

The definition again of three days, in the case of the Egyptian slave, abandoned by his master, after the burning of Ziklag, is closely in point. The words, 'My master left me, because three days ago I fell sick,' convey the same idea of time, as the mournful expression of the disciples

¹ Hoc modo locutionis, (per tropum sc. synecdochen, quæ facit ut a parte totum, vel a toto pars intelligatur) quo significatur a parte totum, etiam illa de resurrectione Christi solvitur quæstio. Pars enim novissima diei, quo passus est, nisi pro toto die accipiatur, id est adjuncta etiam nocte præterita; et nox in cujus parte ultima resurrexit, nisi totus dies accipiatur, adjuncto scilicet die illucescente Dominico,

non possunt esse tres dies et tres noctes, quibus se in corde terræ prædixit futurum. Aug. *de Doctr. Chr.* 11. 50. Gregory of Nyssa also notices the difficulty, (*in Res. Or.* 1.), but offers no solution that can be accepted.

יְרֵב בֶּקֶר אֲלֵפִים
וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת

on the way to Emmaus, 'Beside all this, to-day is the third day since these things were done.' But it is evident, that 'three days and three nights' was a popular synonym for this period of time; for when David discovered him, 'he had eaten no bread, nor drunk any water three days and three nights.' It was not that his sickness, which was antecedent to his desertion, prevented him from eating; for as soon as food was set before him, and 'he had eaten, his spirit came to him again;' but the three days and three nights during which he had fasted marked the period, in popular language, at the commencement of which his master had abandoned him to perish in the desert, three days before; i. e. it involved only so much of the day as had elapsed, when David found him; so much of the first day as remained, with its night; and the whole of the intermediate day and night. The words of Scripture cannot bear an exact literal meaning, unless we imagine, contrary to every rule of interpretation, that his master left him exactly at the commencement of the first day; and that David found him exactly at the commencement of the fourth day; for in any other case there would be either a deficiency or a superfluity, wholly inconsistent with a strictly literal interpretation. The words in the book of the prophet Jonah, therefore, that he 'was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights,' may mean no more than that the period commenced in some portion of one day, and was brought to a close before the next day but one was determined;

Jewish
Triduum.

Luke xxiv.
21.

Jon. i. 17.

Jewish
Triduum.

Jon. i. 17.

See Justin.
p. 382.

the fractional portions being computed as days, beginning with the evening; or, vernacularly, as days and nights. But even if the strict meaning of the prophet's words be adopted, some latitude may always be allowed in the application of a personal type. It is sufficient if the general agreement hold good. So Elias was, in a general way, a type of the Baptist; so Moses was, only in some particulars, a type of Christ; and so also, if Jonas remained engulphed in the whale for three whole days and nights, his case would be exactly typical of Christ's burial, so far as the entombment is concerned; and approximately also a type, with relation to the time during which that separation from the outer world continued. Our Lord, in adapting to himself the type of Jonas, makes use of the very words of Scripture; which may well admit a certain latitude in their application. But since it was his country's custom to consider the day to be incomplete without the night, no alteration of the words of Scripture was required, in order that his hearers might form a proper appreciation of his meaning¹. But whatever explanation be adopted, the historical fact remains un-

¹ It is observable, that Irenæus (v. 31) in quoting the Saviour's words, omits the second statement of time, and writes simply, 'so shall the Son of Man be in the heart of the earth.' And Tertullian renders the words generally by 'Siquidem Christum in corde terræ triduum mortis legimus expunctum.' *De An.* l.v. Similar conventional computations of time are exhibited in other

languages. The Saxon terms *fort' night*, *se'n'night*, convey to the mind no true notion of the night; the period included between Sunday morning, and the second Saturday evening, would still be a *fort'night*, although it counted only thirteen nights. The French expression for a fortnight, *quinze jours*, requires the same latitude of interpretation; as also the German '*acht Tage*.'

altered; that our Lord was put to death on the day preceding the weekly Sabbath; which, in this year, coincided with the Paschal Sabbath, and was the high, or initial day of the Paschal feast. Our Lord therefore was put to death on the Friday. It is also clear that he rose again after the completion of the Sabbath, and before the dawn of the first day of the week; which has ever since been observed by the Christian Church as the Lord's Day.

Παρα-
σκευῇ.

It should also be observed, that the Sabbath eve, or sixth day of the week, having obtained among the Jews since the captivity the distinctive appellation of *עֶרְבֹתָא*, or the Eve, the Jews of the dispersion named the same day 'The preparation,' or *παρασκευῇ*. Strictly speaking, the preparation, or Sabbath eve, commenced at the ninth hour; although St John, in speaking of the sixth hour of this day, says that it was 'the preparation.' And the Talmud expressly names the whole of the sixth day *עֶרְבֹתָא*; the exact word whereby the Syriac renders *παρασκευῇ* wherever it occurs in the Gospels, and which we therefore understand to mean, not the preparation for the Paschal feast, but the sixth day of the week, that preceded the ordinary Sabbath; so St Mark interprets the term as being synonymous with *προσάββατον*. Ἦν γὰρ *παρασκευῇ, ὃ ἐστι προσάββατον*. There is a text also in St John's Gospel, the diction of which altogether harmonises with the notion that in this year the first day of the Paschal feast, kept as a Sabbath, coincided with the weekly Sabbath.

Judith viii. 6.

Jos. Ant.
Jud. xvi. 62.
Beresh. Rab.
See Buxtorf.
ערב.

Defined
by type.

John xix. 31.

There is a peculiar emphasis in the article, where he says, that, 'the Jews, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day,' ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ, on such a Sabbath day as this, 'ἣν γὰρ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου,' for the day of that Sabbath was the great day of the Paschal feast, 'besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away;' the high days of the great feasts being the first and the last days on which there was held 'a holy convocation unto the Lord.'

Further, there are two types of the Law that so exactly define the period of our Lord's entombment, as well as the character of the sacrifice of his death that preceded, and of his Resurrection that completed the period, that we may safely infer that the Holy Spirit intended the period itself to be exactly determined by them. It is impossible to doubt that the Paschal lamb, not a bone of which was broken, was typical of Christ.

John xix. 36.
1 Cor. v. 7.

'Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us.' And whatever rule our Lord followed, in celebrating the Passover the day previous to that on which the

Matt. xxvi. 2.
Luke xxii. 15.

feast was generally kept at Jerusalem, we are certain that it was the Passover that he kept; and that he kept it in the vesper commencement of the same day on which He gave Himself in sacrifice upon the Cross. 'When even was come, he sat

Matt. xxvi.
20.

down with the twelve.' St Luke says more defi-

Luke xxii.
14.

nitely, 'When the hour was come;' that is, the first hour of the first Paschal day. The burial of our

Lord within four and twenty hours, at the close of this same day, shews that the commencement of the period, during which he lay dead, was defined by the Paschal type. The close of the period was not less clearly marked by the wave-offering of the first-fruits of the harvest. For St Paul identifies¹ this offering with the Resurrection as its significant type: 'Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept.' 'Christ the first-fruits.' We know indeed that by the law of Moses the first-fruits of the year's produce, (brought in the climate of Palestine to a rapid maturity), were offered as a wave-offering, on the sixteenth of Nisan², the day following that upon which the Passover was eaten; just as the final ingathering of the produce of the year, whether vintage or corn harvest, was celebrated by the eucharistic feast of Tabernacles. Therefore, on the day following the Sabbath, throughout the whole of which our Lord's body lay in the tomb, this wave-offering would in due legal course be made in the Temple; and on that same day, Christ, the first-fruits of them that slept, came forth from the tomb. St Paul's term is too definite, and too closely applicable to the ceremony that was ob-

Defined
by type.
Luke xxii. 14.

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 20.

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 23.

Lev. xxiii.
10, 11.

Exod. xxiii.
16,
Deut. xvi. 13.

¹ The first Epistle to the Corinthians was written before the feast of Pentecost, 1 Cor. xvi. 8. Internal evidence would indicate Easter as its probable date. For the Apostle speaks as though the Paschal feast were then present, 'Christ our pass-over is sacrificed for us, therefore, *ἐορτάζομεν*, let us keep the feast, not with the old leaven,' &c. 1 Cor.

v. 7, 8. It was the season also of the wave-offering of the first ripened corn, hence the comparison of Christ to the firstfruits, 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23. In any case, the Apostle considered the wave-offering to be as truly a type of Christ as the paschal lamb.

² See Michaelis on the Laws of Moses, cxcvii. § 1.

Defined
by type.

served in the Temple, on the very day of our Lord's Resurrection, and which was of annual observance at Easter-tide, to have been a casual coincidence.

Hence the custom that had grown up, of allowing the Passover to be sacrificed on two consecutive days, would appear to be wholly providential; for that custom alone enabled the death of Christ to be symbolised by the one type, as his Resurrection was by the other. If the Passover had been wholly limited to one day, Christ could hardly have died upon the cross on the Paschal sabbath. Or if this had taken place, his burial upon that day, followed by his Resurrection on the next, when the wave-offering was exhibited, would not have given that full proof of the reality of his death, which was afforded by the strict guard kept over his tomb for an entire day and night. Again, if Christ had been put to death before the Passover was kept, He would not have been 'the very Paschal Lamb;' and had the day after the Paschal Sabbath been the day of his death, the first-fruits would have been offered upon that same day, and the type dissolved. By the latitude of a choice between two Paschal days, now sanctioned by authority, these two important types retained their full significance, and Christ, according to the All-wise counsel of God, continued until the third day in the tomb. Thus the wave-offering was in fact a highly significant rite.

And clearly as the types of the Old Dispensation represent to us Christian mysteries, none is more

clear than this primitival offering. The summer of light and warmth is at hand; the harvest of the earth is ripening; the time is fulfilled, and the Lord of the harvest is about to send labourers into his harvest. And this is an exact picture of the spiritual state of the world when Christ arose from the dead. Men felt their need of something higher and holier than any human system could teach. The worship of Jehovah had been carried far and wide throughout the world by the Jews. It had been extensively adopted by proselytes from among the nations. The whole world was under the dominion of the Romans; and unity of government was favourable to the rapid circulation of opinion. The harvest of the earth was ripening; the time, therefore, was fulfilled, and the Lord of the harvest had provided his workmen; ‘Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.’ The wave-offering.

John xii. 24.

Our Lord’s death, then, was typified by the Paschal sacrifice; its duration was determined by the wave-offering of the seasonable first-fruits; and these two types clearly shew, that it was a part of the eternal counsels, that Christ should rise again the third day after his death.

In God’s good providence it had been ordained that some time should elapse between the death and resurrection of Christ. All that took place during that period to confirm the reality of those two events, and of our Lord’s human nature, similar in all respects to our own, is the proof to us of

Apparent
design.

this necessity. For if our Lord had returned to life immediately, either the reality of his death, or of his human body, would have been called in question; and the hands of those heretics would have been proportionably strengthened, whose wild notions, even with every proof of Christ's mortal nature, caused such trouble to the primitive Church. Perhaps too it was requisite that grief, the great chastener of the human heart, should exercise its purifying influence upon the Apostles; and that they should repose awhile upon the memory, however bitter, of the sufferings they had so lately witnessed. After their sad defection, who shall say that their constancy would have been as great without that brief season of affliction, as it was, when learned in the deep shame and sorrow of repentance not to be repented of; assembling themselves together, as they did, that they might mourn and weep? Surely under the assay all baser metal was purely purged out, and the soul prepared for the gift of ghostly strength. But for the very reason of their grief, our Lord in his mercy would not long delay his Resurrection, lest they should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow. He had given to them a promise of comfort, and he was not slack in redeeming it; 'Because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your heart;' 'And ye now therefore have sorrow: but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you.' 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, That ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice: and ye shall

Mark xvi. 10.

2 Cor. ii. 7.

John xvi. 6;
22.

John xvi. 20.

be sorrowful, but your sorrow shall be turned into joy.' 'Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.' The Lord's
Day.

The Resurrection of Christ ever after caused the consecration of the first day of the week to the service of the Lord. As by baptism in the river Jordan, the Son of God sanctified water to the mystical washing away of sin; and as by taking upon him flesh and blood, our sinful nature is redeemed to God; so by rising upon the first day of the week for our justification, he consecrated it to his service as the commencement of the new creation. But the Lord's Day was not so sanctified, as to supersede the sabbatical observance of one day in seven as a day of rest; an ordinance coeval with creation. But a new spiritual character was given to an institution that the Jews had made so wholly carnal, and overlaid with various burthensome superstitions. The Sabbath from the first was made for man in mercy to the body; and it was not less needed as a day of bodily rest under the Gospel, than it was under the Law. Only under the Gospel the true object of the Sabbath was restored; of spiritualizing the affections, and raising man from the dust of the earth to God his Redeemer. This was only partially known to the Jewish teachers as the true purpose of the Sabbath; while the people were wholly chained down by bodily acts and restrictions and low notions of its use. Thus, Maimonides rises no higher in his notion of the Sabbath, than to allow it to be 'the enfranchisement of the seventh part of man's life from toil and labour, the preservative also and con-

The Lord's
Day.

But, with the Christian, the day on which Christ rose from the dead is the Lord's day, 'a delight, honourable;' a day devoted to hearing and doing the will of God, and not our own carnal pleasure; a day commemorative, in word and thought and deed, of the great object for which the Lord rose from the dead: namely, that we should be raised up new men in him; that we put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and be renewed in the spirit of our mind; and that we should put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. Accordingly, we find that the disciples of our Lord observed the Lord's day from the beginning in this spirit; and honoured it as the first day of the new creation. Thus it was on the first day of the week that they were assembled together; when the Lord stood amongst them, and again spake 'Peace' to the Church; and convinced St Thomas of the reality of that Death and Resurrection which he was commissioned to attest. On the first day again was the feast of Pentecost; and the Holy Ghost the Comforter added a fresh measure of sanctity to the day, by descending upon the Church. So again, the first day of every week was appointed by St Paul, as the most convenient day for collecting the charitable contributions of the Church of Corinth, for the poor saints in Judæa; and manifestly because Christians assembled together on that day. It was 'on the Lord's day' also,

More Nevo-
chim, iii. 43.

Isai. lviii. 13.

Eph. iv. 22,
24.

John xx. 26.

1 Cor. xvi. 2.
κατὰ μίαν
σαββάτων.

Rev. i. 10.

that St John was in the Spirit; and the Apoca-
lypse, the mystery still unsolved, was revealed to
the beloved disciple. Bishop Taylor, therefore,
says that under the New Dispensation Christ con-
secrated this day to his service 'by annulling the
Sabbath, and by his Resurrection, and the excellent
appearances and illustrations upon that day; not
by precept, but by indigitation, and remarking that
day by signal actions and a heap of blessings.'

The Lord's
Day.

Ductor Dub.
56.

In the earliest age of Christianity, however,
the Sabbath was still observed by the Church col-
laterally with the Lord's day. ¹This continued for
a few years to be the general practice; and the
Lord's day only gradually superseded the Sabbath.
Ignatius in his epistle to the Magnesians, first
insists upon the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath;
he speaks of Christians as *μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες*, no
longer honouring the Jewish Sabbath; ²For it is a
monstrous thing to name Christ Jesus, and to
Judaize. For Christianity hath not believed in
Judaism, but Judaism in Christianity.'

Acts xiii. 14,
44.
Acts xvi. 13.
Acts xviii. 4.

Vind. Cath.
iii. 470.

Justin Martyr, in the deeply interesting account
that he gives of the Christian worship, speaks of
the first day of the week as being that alone which
possessed, among Christians, a religious character³.
That all who live in town or in country met to-
gether upon this day for the reading of Scripture
and prayer; and to communicate in the Body
and Blood of Christ; that this day was observed

Vind. Cath.
iii. 169, 170.

¹ Burton's *Lect.* A.D. 53.

² Ἀποπον γάρ ἐστι Χριστὸν
Ἰησοῦν λαλεῖν, καὶ Ἰουδαῖζειν. Ὁ
γὰρ Χριστιανισμὸς οὐκ εἰς Ἰου-

δαϊσμόν ἐπίστευσεν, ἀλλ' Ἰουδαί-
σμος εἰς Χριστιανισμόν. *ad Magn. x.*

³ Ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα,
ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς, τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν

The Lord's by the Christian Church. For God commenced
Day. upon it the work of creation; and upon the same day, Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead; upon the day preceding the Sabbath he was crucified; and on the day after Saturday, that is, on Sunday, he appeared to the Apostles and disciples.

It would appear, however, that there were some to be found in the Christian Church, so late as the close of the fourth century, who still paid a degree of observance to the Jewish sabbath, that was hardly consistent with Christian liberty. For the Council of Laodicea decreed; 'That it is not right for Christians to judaize, and to rest upon the Sabbath, but that they should work upon the same day; giving a precedence of honour to the Lord's day, let them rest, if nothing prevent, as Christians. If therefore any be detected in judaizing, let such be separate from Christ¹.'

i.e. if free.

The Lord's day, therefore, can hardly be considered as an exact parallel to the Jewish sabbath. For some time the two days were observed consecutively in the Christian Church; until the inconsistency of still remaining fettered by Jewish observances was thoroughly recognised. The necessity also for purging out that Jewish leaven in the

ἕλην τρέψας, κόσμον ἐποίησε, καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη. τῇ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς κρονικῆς ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν, καὶ τῇ μετὰ τὴν κρονικὴν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡλίου ἡμέρα, φανεῖς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ μαθηταῖς ἐδίδαξε ταῦτα, ἅπερ εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ ὑμῖν ἀνεδόκαμεν. Just. M. *Apol.* LXVII.

¹ Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ χριστιανοὺς ἰουδαΐζειν, καὶ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ σχολάζειν, ἀλλὰ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ· τὴν δὲ κυριακὴν προτιμῶντας, εἴγε δύναιτο, σχολάζειν ὡς χριστιανοί. Εἰ δὲ εὐρεθῇεν ἰουδαΐσται, ἔστωσαν ἀνάθεμα παρὰ Χριστοῦ. *Conc. Laod.* XXIX. *Vind. Cath.* 1. 471.

ritual, which had been so subversive of peace in the doctrinal constitution of the Church, became, in course of time, obvious. Thus, when St Paul says, that Christ nailed to the cross the handwriting of ordinances; he proceeds to charge the Colossians that they vindicate their full Christian liberty; ‘Let no man therefore judge you in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.’ Possibly, also, the Apostle was speaking of the partial observance of the Jewish Sabbath, still permitted in the Church as a thing indifferent, when he wrote to the Romans; ‘One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it.’ But however that may be, we are certain that, without any positive injunction or decree on the part of the Church, the Lord’s day was firmly established in the veneration of the first Christians. The custom of the Church in this respect is most wise and merciful; blending with the spiritual worship of God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a care for the labouring man’s temporal comfort and well-being. It was by the all-wise providence of God, that the Sabbatical rest was ordained from the beginning; the law, ‘brought in because of transgressions,’ added new sanctions for its observance, but when the Law was done away, the Sabbatical rest,

The Lord’s
Day.

Col. ii. 14—
17.

Rom. xiv. 5,
6.

The Lord's Day. possessing an antecedent validity, remained; only all the restrictions with which a morose superstition had overlaid it were annulled; and Christians have been taught to rest, as God commanded, from the beginning; but to sanctify that rest, by worshipping him in spirit and in truth.

He ascended up into Heaven.

John xx. 19, 26.
Matt. xxviii. 7, 16.
John xxi. 14.

Acts i. 3.

Luke xxiv. 49.
Acts i. 4.

Christ, having remained upon earth for forty days after he had risen from the dead; and having appeared to the disciples collectively, on the day of the Resurrection, on the Lord's day following, and after they had gone into Galilee by his appointment, at the lake of Tiberias; no account is preserved in the Gospels of any subsequent manifestations of himself to them, until the final occasion, when he ascended up into heaven. But St Luke says, that the proofs of his resurrection, vouchsafed to the Apostles, were many and various, during the forty days that he was seen of them, and spoke of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God. The supposition, therefore, that he appeared to them on many other occasions, is wholly agreeable to the words of this Evangelist; although it has not been the will of the Spirit that these occasions should be fully revealed in Scripture. All we know is, that, when the time was come for the Son of Man to ascend up where he was before, we find the Apostles once more at Jerusalem in preparation for the feast of weeks; and they were commanded by the Saviour to tarry there until they were endued with power from on high. For the first-fruits of the Holy Spirit were

to be poured forth upon them at Jerusalem; and the first words of the message of glad tidings henceforth to be preached among all nations, should be first addressed to that city.

Foreshewn
by Type.
Luke xxiv.
47.
Acts i. 8.

Once more, therefore, the spirit of prophecy gave notice of the coming event, both by type and prediction. The high priest entering into the holiest of all, 'not without blood,' once, and once only in the yearly course of service, was a typical action, the significance of which has been made known to us by revelation; and was probably declared also to the Apostles by him, who with his own blood now appeared in the presence of God for us. Certainly, it was one of those deep mysteries of the Old Dispensation, that shewed clearly that Christ ought to suffer, and to enter into his glory; and upon which St Paul discourses at large among the hierurgical mysteries declared in the epistle to the Hebrews. The high priest, it is true, repeated that mystical action year after year, that Christ performed in substance once for all. But so were all the ritual types renewed with the revolving year; the feast of Tabernacles with its glad Hosannas, descriptive of the Advent of Christ; the Paschal Lamb, the wave-offering, were shadows forecast by the Sun of Righteousness; and were annual representations of Christ in the solemnities of the Law. Those types were not impaired by recurrence; but in each yearly course they represented once, that which should be realised in Christ once for all. And as those symbolical ordinances presignified the Incarnation, the

Heb. ix. 7.
Exod. xxx.
10.

Heb. ix. 24.

Heb. ix. 12.

Foreshewn by Prophecy. sacrifice of the death of Christ, and his Resurrection; so also the entrance of the high priest into the Holy of Holies, shewed forth the ascension of Christ into heaven 'with his own blood,' there to offer in our behalf, all the circumstances and ensanguined acts of his Incarnation; his holy nativity and circumcision; his agony and bloody sweat; his cross and passion; his precious death and burial; and to claim for us by right of his glorious resurrection and ascension, that outpouring of the Holy Ghost, which should be the real spiritual union of man with God upon earth; and the earnest of everlasting glory in Christ hereafter.

The Ascension of Christ into heaven was also predicted by the Psalmist; 'Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them.' St Paul interprets the words as applying to the gift of the Holy Ghost; and supports his interpretation by a plain reference to the words of Christ, 'No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven.' And again; 'What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?' The Apostle's words are, 'Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended

Psal. lxxviii.
18.

John iii. 13.

John vii. 62.

Eph. iv. 7—
12.

first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.)

Foreshewn
by
Prophecy.

And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.' In this reference to the Psalm, as is often the case where the sacred writers make quotations from the older Scriptures, less is expressed than the original words will bear. Something is left to be made good by a knowledge of Scripture in him that readeth. And so the words of king David speak of the exceeding riches of God's grace in converting the rebellious; as well as of those other extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, which were needed for the 'perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.' But the Apostle was speaking only of these latter manifestations of the spirit; and therefore he quotes no more of the text from the Psalms, than suited his immediate subject. The conclusion of the chapter however is so close a commentary on the closing words of the passage in the Psalms, as to justify the supposition that the Apostle shaped his warning by the terms of that Scripture; while he shewed the Gentile converts to whom he was writing, that the pardon of their former rebellion had been sealed to them by those gifts of the Holy Spirit, the sure proof of the Lord God dwelling among them.

Eph. iv. 12.

Eph. iv. 18—
22.

The idea formerly attached to this passage of

Rabbinical
gloss.

the Psalms by the Jews, was clearly in harmony with our own, as we may see by the Chaldee paraphrase, when divested of two interpolations, which the ¹Jewish editors of the Rabbinical Bible have not failed to mark as being in no way pertinent; 'Thou hast ascended up to heaven; Thou hast led captivity captive; and thou hast conferred gifts upon them, the children of men; and also as regards the rebellious who become converted, and repent them truly, upon them dwelleth the Shekinah of the glory of the Lord God.' In the passage thus interpreted, there is the same reference as in the Hebrew, to one, whose Ascension on high has procured gifts for the children of men; but that ascension is stated more specifically to have been into heaven; while the latter portion is rendered closely in accordance with the Christian doctrine, that by virtue of such ascension the Holy Spirit, the Shekinah of glory, now has his habitation in the hearts of his penitent and faithful followers.

The reality of the human nature of our risen

¹ The original is printed thus in the Rabbinical Bible, סִלְקָתָא לְרַקְנָע [מִשָּׁה נִבְיָא] שְׁבִיתָא שְׁבִיתָא [אַלְפָתָא פְּתֻנְמִי אֹרִיתָא] יְהִבְתָּא לְהוֹן מִתָּנֹן לְבָנֵי נָשָׂא וְבָרַם סֶרְפְּנִיָּא דִּי מִתְּגִירִין וְתִיבִין בְּתַתּוּבָה שְׁרָת עֲלֵיהוֹן שְׁכִינַת יִקְרָא דִּי

אֱלֹהִים The words interpolated, and bracketed from the context by the editors, are manifestly a gloss copied from the Targum upon v. 11. יְיָ יְהִיב פְּתֻנְמִי אֹרִיתָא לְעַמִּיָּה בָרַם מִשָּׁה וְאַחֲרוֹן מִבְּשָׁרֹן מִימֵר אֱלֹהָא לְחִילִית רַבָּא דִּישְׂרָאֵל

Lord, so likely to be called in question by the half-instructed, from the fact of his Resurrection from the grave, and ascension into heaven, was proved to the disciples most fully, during the forty days that separated the latter event from the former. Ignatius, in consequence of the Docetic errors of his day, is careful to exhibit this proof of our Lord's real humanity; 'He suffered truly, as he truly raised himself; not as some unbelievers say, that he suffered in appearance only. . . . For I know that after the Resurrection also he was in the flesh, and I believe that he is so still. And when he came to those who were with Peter, he said, Take and handle me, and see that I am no disembodied spirit. And immediately they touched him and believed, having been convinced by His Flesh and by the Spirit. Wherefore they even despised death, and were found superior to it. But after the Resurrection he ate and drank with them, as having a fleshly body, howbeit that he was spiritually one with the Father.'

Bodily
Ascension.

The time having arrived for the fulfilment of the legal type, and of King David's prophecy, as well as of our Lord's own assurances; He 'led them out as far as Bethany, and lifted up his

Luke xxiv.
50.

¹ *Ad Smyrn.* 2: 'Αληθῶς ἑπαθεν, ὡς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀνέστησεν ἑαυτόν· οὐχ' ὥσπερ ἄπιστοί τινες λέγουσιν τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πεπονθέναι,..... Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα, καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα. Καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς, λάβετε, ψιλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ

εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἄσώματον. Καὶ εὐ-
θὺς αὐτοῦ ἦψαντο, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν,
κρατηθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ
τῷ Πνεύματι. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ θα-
νάτου κατεφρόνησαν, ἠρέθησαν δὲ
ὑπὲρ θάνατον. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνά-
στασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέ-
πιεν ὡς σαρκικὸς, καί περ πνευ-
ματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ Πατρί.

Doctrinal
Statement.

Acts i. 9.

hands and blessed them;’ and ‘while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight.’ Our Lord ascended into heaven in the same body that rose again from the dead; and which the disciples knew to be a body, in nature at least, like their own. For our Lord partook of human food with them during these days, He saw with his eyes, and heard with his ears, and spake with his tongue, and reasoned with the intellect; the proof, therefore, was complete and good to their senses, that our Lord’s body was endowed with the same organs, and possessed the same faculties after as before the Resurrection; and it was in the self-same body that he subsequently ascended up into heaven; ‘while they beheld he was taken up.’ As the Son of Man, he now ascended up, where, as the Son of God, He had been eternally; from whence also he shall return again with power and great glory; ‘this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.’ As the Word, and Son of the Father, he had subsisted eternally in the bosom of the Father; as the Son of Man he now left the world, to sit down at the right hand of God in Majesty and Power, the Incarnate King of Glory. ‘He ascended up into heaven, not as though God the Word had not existed there previously, for in truth he was always in heaven, indwelling in the Father, but there the Word made flesh, had not as yet sat down. Because this entrance, therefore, through the gates of heaven, appeared novel to the ministering and

Acts i. 11.

principal spirits, they, beholding the nature of the flesh penetrating into the inner heavens, spake one to another, as David full of the Holy Ghost had spoken; Lift up your gates, ye princes (*οἱ ἄρχοντες*, LXX.), and be ye lift up ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in. Who is this King of Glory? The Lord, mighty and powerful, the Lord mighty in battle. Words uttered, not with reference to the power of the Godhead, but with respect to the novelty of the flesh ascending to the right hand of God¹. In the converse way, since the Son of Man is the Lord from heaven, He speaks of himself also, as having come down from heaven; ‘And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.’ For by reason of the union of the two natures in one Divine Person, Christ was both the Son of Man and the Son of God; and whatever may be predicated of the one nature is personally true of the other. As the Son of God, Christ had existed from all eternity in heaven; this was now true personally of the Son of Man, though manifestly not of the human nature. The Son of Man entered into heaven as the King of Glory; and as Jeremiah designated Christ, Jehovah our Righteousness, so King David applies

Doctrinal
Statement.

Psal. xxiv. 7.

John iii. 13.

¹ Denique quia novus iste ingressus portarum cœli æditus et principibus videbatur, videntes naturam carnis secreta cœlorum penetrantem, dicunt ad invicem, sicut David plenus Spiritu sancto denunciavit, dicens: Tollite portas principes vestras et elevamini portæ æternales, et

introbibit rex gloriæ. Quis est iste rex gloriæ? Dominus fortis et potens, Dominus potens in prælio. Quæ vox utique non propter divinitatis potentiam, sed propter novitatem carnis ascendentis ad Dei dexteram, ferebatur. Ruff. *de Symb.* § 31. *Vind. Cath.* i. 576.

Doctrinal
Statement.

Heb. x. 12.

Heb. i. 3, 4.

the same name of awe to the newly inaugurated King. 'Who is this King of Glory, Jehovah Sabaoth, He is the King of Glory¹.' Hence it is that the Apostle in speaking of the present Majesty of Christ, and declaring to us his session at the right hand of God, describes it at one while as the glorification of his human nature; 'This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God;' while another passage of the same epistle, defines that state of glory to be His own natural inheritance as the eternal Son of God. 'Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels,

¹ It is always a matter of some interest to know the way in which such noble predictions of Christ are explained by the Jews. This passage is universally referred to the formal deposit of the ark of the covenant in the Holy of Holies by king Solomon. Aben Ezra says, 'Our elders of blessed memory say that this indicates the entrance of the ark into the Holy of Holies, wherefore it is written above; Who shall stand in thy holy place.' אמרו קדמונים זל" כי זה רמז להכנס ארון על בית קדשי הקדשים על כן כתוב למעלה במקום קדשי R. S. Jarchi says more definitely that, 'In the days of Solomon his son, when he attempted

to bring in the ark into the Holy of Holies, the gates clave together; he uttered four and twenty pious hymns, and no answer was made to him, until he said, Turn not away the face of thine Anointed (Ps. cxxxii. 10), remember the mercies of David thy servant.' בימי שלומה בנו כשיבא להכניס ארון לבית קדשי הקדשים ודבקו שערים זה בזה אמר עשרים וארבע רננות ולא נענה עד שאמר אל תשב פני משיחך זכרה לחסדי דוד עבדך The original Rabbinical myth is found in the Midrash Tehillim in its full puerility. How long will such tales satisfy the Jewish mind?

as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.'

Into
Heaven.

With regard to the place whither our Lord ascended up, all that we can know for the present is, that it is the actual presence of God; but as God cannot be circumscribed by space, no notion of locality can satisfy our ideas upon this subject. Heaven, God's dwelling-place, is over all that we see, and in all, and through all. Vast as is the firmament above our heads, and infinite as it appears to the eye, it is immeasurably too small and insignificant for his abode. The soul may gaze upon its myriads of stars and lose itself in its awe, yet appliances of greater perfection bring in new worlds to the field of vision. That which we see therefore, we believe to be but an infinitesimal portion of the whole treasure-house of the firmament. And yet, this almost boundless expanse of worlds, is less than the least conceivable atom, as compared with the immensity of the Lord God of Hosts; what local habitation, therefore, can we assign to him, who already filleth all things? And the Deity thus Infinite and Incomprehensible, was one with the Son of Man; 'one, not by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by the taking of the Manhood into God.' When therefore, the Son of Man ascended up into heaven, this involved no local movement of the Godhead, which is present equally in every portion of space, and in every moment of time, whether past or present or future. But the human nature of Christ ascended up where as yet it was not; and now, inseparably one as

Into
Heaven.

it is with the Godhead, it is inseparable from it in Infinite Majesty and Glory; for by a heavenly mystery, we know not how, the attributes of Christ our heavenly King are the attributes of the Eternal Invisible God. When, therefore, it is said in Scripture, and in the Creed, that Christ is seated in heaven at the right hand of God, the local place of honour is figurative. It is the usual way of Scripture to express by such physical emblems spiritual and abstract truths. The meaning of the symbol is evident; that Christ made perfect through sufferings, is now raised to the highest Glory and Majesty and Power; 'Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him;' 'that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' But where Christ is, enthroned in glory, there we also hope to be, and to see him as he is; 'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.' The idea of a local heaven, which consists not with the immensity of the Deity, whom the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain, is wholly in harmony with beings that are finite, and

1 Pet. iii. 22.

Phil. ii. 10,
11.

John xiv. 1—
3.

1 Kings viii.
27.

whose faith is that they shall be raised again in the same body that suffers death. Thus if we hope to inherit those pleasures that are at God's right hand for evermore, we look also for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness; 'a city that hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God doth lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.' It was of the kingdom of heaven, that we hope to behold, and of Christ the King of Glory who should open it to all believers, that the Psalmist prophetically sung, 'Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in.' Earthly and gross as our mortal bodies are by reason of the flesh, our hope is, that they shall be made like unto Christ's glorious body, and so be fitted for the wholly spiritual blessedness of that kingdom.

Into
Heaven.

Psal. xvi. 11.

2 Pet. iii. 13.
Rev. xxi. 23.

Psal. xxiv. 7.

'When our Lord knew that his hour was come, that he should depart out of the world unto the Father,' he declared plainly, by the truth contained in these words of the Creed, his absolute unity with God; 'Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God.' For the Jews at once understood the words as an assertion of consubstantiality with the Father; 'Then said they all, Art thou then the Son of God?' and He whose humiliation was now verging upon its lowest depth, vouchsafed the answer; 'Ye say that I am,' or, as the same words are elsewhere rendered, 'that I am He.' The Syriac translation, into

And sitteth
at the right
hand of
God.
John xiii. 1.

Luke xxii.
69.

John viii.
24, 28.
ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.

And sitteth
at the right
hand of
God.

p. 266.

Matt. xxii.
42—45.

which our Lord's words return with vernacular fidelity, renders both passages by the same term, לֵּן לֵּן , 'that I AM.' To sit down, therefore, at the right hand of the Majesty on High, is interpreted by our Lord himself, as a proof that the eternal Majesty of God was his by inheritance; and as he publicly affixed this meaning to the term when questioned by the Jewish hierarchy on the eve of his Passion, so he directed the minds of his hearers into the same channel, and asserted the same eternal truth, as we have seen, upon that former occasion, when he in his turn questioned his opponents, 'saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?' For the manner in which our Lord introduced this question from the Psalms, clearly shews that he interpreted it of himself, not only as possessing all the dignity and authority that the Jews had ever attached to the notion of the Messiah, but far more, as possessing by inheritance that position at God's right hand in the eternal power and majesty of the Godhead, that belongs alone to the Son. 'What think ye of Christ, whose son is he¹?' The son

¹ The Targum, although it inserts matter in no way pertinent to the subject, still might have led his hearers to the true answer; for it renders Ps. cx. 1, 'The Lord said

unto his Word.' Clearly such an interpretation could never square with the later Rabbinical notions, whereby the Psalm is explained of Abraham, or David, or Hezekiah or

of David he might indeed be according to the flesh; but of infinitely higher honour, and power, and glory must He be, of whom David speaking by the Spirit had said, 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.' In whatever sense the Lord is said in the Psalms to have been placed at the right hand of God, in the same sense the expression is also used in the Creed. As therefore our Lord himself has taught us the truth, that lay veiled beneath King David's words, so also that same truth is asserted in the Creed. Of the Son alone it can be true, that he sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; the mention of the Eternal Father involving of necessity the relation of the Eternal Son. Because 'He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; therefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' The 'Father of Glory' 'hath set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all

And sitteth
at the right
hand of
God.

Phil. ii. 8—
11.

Eph. i. 17,
20—22.

Zorobabel, or nationally of the whole people of Israel; whereas it is true alone of him, who, after the order of Melchizedek, was King as well as Priest, and of whom the Psalm proceeds to discourse. To Jesus Christ alone that royal priesthood pertains, and to him alone can the words of David, in their ulti-

mate meaning, apply. 'If the Jews had conceived the prophecy belonged either to Abraham or David, or any of the rest since mentioned by the Jews, they might very well, and questionless would, have answered our Saviour, that this belonged not to the Son of David.' Pearson.

Mediatorial
kingdom.

principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church.'

And because he is head over all things to the Church, the Mediatorial Kingdom, to which these words of the Creed refer, must continue until the end. But then, as Faith shall have its consummation, when the actual enjoyment of God's promises is granted to us; and as Hope shall cease and determine, when the substance of things hoped for shall have become realities; 'for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?' so also the Mediatorial Kingdom of Christ shall be achieved, when God shall at length be all and in all; and the Kingdoms of this world shall have become perfectly, as they shall from thenceforth and for ever be, the Kingdoms of God and of his Christ. We look for a Kingdom in which dwelleth righteousness, we hope to be clothed in Christ's perfect righteousness, and by virtue of his atonement, to be presented wholly pure and spotless before God; manifestly, therefore, when by the mercy of God¹, and through the grace of Christ, this state of glory shall have been shed around the Church triumphant in heaven,

¹ Contemplabimur enim Deum Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum, cum mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri, ut jam non interpellet pro nobis mediator et sacerdos noster, Filius Dei et Filius hominis; sed et ipse in quantum

sacerdos est assumpta propter nos servi forma, subjectus sit ei qui illi subiecit omnia, et cui subiecit omnia; ut in quantum Deus est, cum illo nos subjectos habeat; in quantum sacerdos, nobiscum illi subiectus sit. August. *de Trin.* i. 20. *Vind. Cath.* i. 51.

and when all things shall have been gathered together in one in Christ, His mediatorial office must cease; for 'a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one;' and through Christ we shall then have been made one Spirit with the Lord; 'then shall the Son also himself be subject to Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all.' Mediatorial kingdom.

But we may not imagine, because the Mediatorial character of Christ's kingly administration shall cease when the final cause of it, the glory of the Church triumphant, shall have been attained; for this reason, that his Majesty and Honour shall be divested of a single attribute; He must still be for ever King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; but the idea of mediation between Man and God involves the idea of the imperfection of the creature, and it is the Mediatorial office of Christ to abolish this imperfection, and to present as many as receive him, perfect before God; so that 'when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.' God is for ever without variableness, or shadow of turning; but the relations of the Church of Christ to her heavenly head shall be altogether changed, and receive their full consummation, when her warfare is accomplished, and when at length it is vouchsafed to her, wholly to enter into the joy of her Lord. It is the change of the creature into the likeness of the glory of Christ, and not any variableness in the Creator that is declared to us in the cessation of Christ's mediatorial kingdom. Since the Church triumphant in heaven, which consists

Mediatorial kingdom. wholly of the spirits of just men made perfect and of the blessed angels, is infinitely more holy and glorious than the Church on earth, that is still compassed about with much infirmity, and sore let and hindered in running her course; therefore the consummation of Christ's Mediatorial Kingdom shall involve the greater glory, because God shall be all in all. Throughout the ages of eternity no will shall then be known but the good and holy will of God; no mortal passions shall arouse discordant elements, or mar the harmony of heaven; no base thought of self shall individualize the spirit; for when Christ who is our life shall appear, we shall not only appear with him in glory, but Christ himself shall be the measure of that glory, and his own adorable Spirit of Infinite Love shall be its manifestation. Evidently, then, the mediatorial character of Christ's kingdom shall only cease, because it shall be wholly merged in the perfect blessedness of heaven; when God's Kingdom shall indeed be come, when God's will shall indeed be done.

But in the mean time, so long as there remains any thing that raises itself in opposition to the Cross, and so long as the times are not fulfilled, the mediatorial office continues; and Christ ever
Rom. viii. 34. abideth at the right hand of God, there to make intercession for us, and to plead in our behalf, his lowly Nativity and Incarnation; his painful and toil-worn ministry, sprinkled with blood in every principal part; his Agony and Bloody Sweat, his Meritorious Cross and Passion, his Precious Death

and Burial. And these circumstances of his Medi-
 ation, deep and awful mysteries as they are, must Mediatorial
kingdom.
 not only be our Redemption, but they must be-
 come living realities in our every-day life; they
 who are baptized must put on Christ, not nomi-
 nally but actually; and the virtue and power of
 each Mediatorial action and suffering of the Lord,
 must overrule both the outward and inward life
 of the disciple.

The benefit arising from the enthronement of
 Christ at the right hand of God, that is expressed
 by the Apostle as a continued act of intercession,
 is declared by the Psalmist to be the gradual and
 entire subjugation of every thing that exalts itself
 against the will of God: 'Sit thou on my right
 hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.' It
 matters not from what source enmity to the Cross
 of Christ proceed; whether it be from temptations
 without a man, or evil passions and an unreclaimed
 will and vices of the intellect within; they are the
 foes of God, which it is the present purpose of the
 Mediator to subdue. He is seated at the right
 hand of God, for the individual good and sanc-
 tification of each separate soul that he has created.
 It is no indefinite and vague reality, then, that
 is declared to us, when we are assured that Christ
 must reign till he hath put all enemies under his
 feet. Either the body of sin must be destroyed by 1 Cor. xv. 25.
 his grace, or the sinful body be eternally judged. It
 is a very definite and distinct truth, therefore, that
 in whatever respect each Christian is conscious of
 doing, or thinking, or saying, any thing that is

Mediatorial
 kingdom. at variance with the holy, and just, and good will
 of God, that deed, or thought, or word, is a bitter
 foe of Christ, to be vanquished by his grace, or
 to be consumed beneath his wrath. Plain as a
 man's duty is, cordially to confess by a right faith
 that Christ now reigns in glory, at the right hand
 of God; his first care resulting from that faith
 should be, to see that his worst foes be not they of
 his own household; that his own passions unmor-
 tified, that his own heart unsanctified, that evil
 unchecked, and for ever rearing its crest within
 the sanctuary of the soul, do not rank him among
 the deadly foes of Christ; for every thing shall
 be subdued under his feet, at that day at least,
 when we shall all stand before the judgment-seat
 of Christ to be judged for deeds done in the body,
 and long since passed away, whether they be good,
 or whether they be evil. In a far different way
 Christ, seated at the right hand of God, gradually
 triumphs over the remaining powers of evil in the
 redeemed; and the work of grace is carried on
 John xvi. 7. according to his gracious promise, 'I, if I be lifted
 up, will draw all men unto me;' 'It is expedient
 for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the
 Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart,
 Micali vii. 19. I will send him unto you.' 'He will turn again,
 he will have compassion upon us; he will subdue
 our iniquities; and thou wilt cast all their sins into
 the depths of the sea.' For the present we are
 subject to the attacks of Satan, and the infirmities
 of the flesh; and we need his continual interces-
 sion to obtain the pardon of our transgressions,

and his never failing grace to strengthen us in the hour of need. But when the last enemy, death, shall have been destroyed, the same destruction shall engulph the principle of evil also that hath the power of death; and sin shall no longer exist, when death, the wages of sin, shall be no more. 'The redeemed of the Lord shall return, and come with singing unto Zion; and everlasting joy shall be upon their head: they shall obtain gladness and joy; and sorrow and mourning shall flee away.'

Mediatorial
kingdom.

Isai. li. 11.

The presence of God, in the heaven of heavens, at whose right hand Christ is seated, is the presence of God the Father Almighty; not as though the Son and Holy Ghost were not fully included with the Father in the name of the Lord God Almighty; but the Creed having designated the Son, as proceeding forth from the Father Almighty by generation; and having set down in detail all that He hath done for us men, and for our salvation; in due course His Ascension into heaven, is identified to the mind with a resumption of the glory, that he had with the Father before the worlds began; 'For this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.' In the Greek copies of the Roman Creed it is observable, that the word rendered Almighty in the opening of the Creed, is Παντοκράτωρ; while in this clause we find Παντοδύνατος. They are equally expressive of the attribute of Omnipotence; but possibly with

The Father
Almighty.

Heb. x. 12,
13.

Παντοδύ-
νατος.

Job xiv. 4.

this distinction, that whereas the term Παντο-
κράτωρ applies to the Almighty Energy of God, as
manifested in the Creation and Preservation of the
natural, and the Government of the moral world;
so the term Παντοδύνατος may refer more pecu-
liarly to the operation of God in the world of
grace. ‘Who can bring a clean thing out of an
unclean?’ is the question of Job, meaning that no
finite power is equal to the reconciliation of such
an opposition. But with God all things are pos-
sible, and to Him alone it appertains to denounce
death as the wages of sin, and yet with entire
truth and justice to confer eternal life upon the
sinner. He therefore who is just, and yet the
justifier of him that believeth; whose Wisdom is as
the combined rays of Perfect Justice, and Infinite
Mercy, may with a peculiar propriety be glorified
by His creatures, as Παντοδύνατος. There is none
indeed so wholly lost in the wilderness of the
world, but that God can bring him back to the
dwellings of peace; no heart so hardened in rebel-
lion, but that he can melt it by deeds of mercy
and loving-kindness; none so dead and insensible
to the voice of his dear Son, but that the energy
of Divine Grace can quicken that unreflecting
spirit with the gift of life eternal. In this sense,
therefore, it would seem to be that Christ, the
Mediator between God and Man, is said to sit ‘on
the right hand of God the Father Almighty;’
the Father being here affirmed to be Almighty,
with a peculiar reference to his dispensation of
Grace; for ‘He is able to save to the uttermost,

Heb. vii. 25.

them that come to Him through Christ;' but he is able also to vindicate the Majesty of his Justice and Truth, and to punish everlastingly all, who having been blessed with the means of grace, are not found again in Christ.

Παντοδύ-
νατος.

The last particular respecting the Mediatorial office of Christ is, that having sat down at the right hand of God, he shall come from thence 'to judge the quick and the dead.' A strict account shall then be taken of every talent, and every grace, that each individual of the race of Adam has received. No reasonable being can doubt the reality of this awful tribunal; not only is it described to us with a fearful particularity in Scripture; but the whole framework and constitution of society bears witness to the fact. A day of final retribution alone enables us to account for the many anomalies, that else would seem to interfere with the regular and orderly operations of Divine Justice. Manifold instances of design, as we have already seen, prove to us that the work of Creation was the act of a perfect Intelligence. The remarkable provision that has been made for the comfort and happiness of the millions of creatures that people the earth, declares to us the goodness of God. But when we turn from the world of nature to God's moral government, we cannot fail to be struck with numerous instances, in which the ordinary course and disposition of events does not altogether harmonize with what we learn of God in the natural world. Here

From
whence he
shall come
to judge.

Moral
proof of
future
judgment.

order and regularity prevail to a degree that cannot escape the notice of the most sceptical observer. The simple unity of the Laws of Nature also, shews them to be so completely self-harmonious, as to amount to a substantive proof of the Unity of the Deity; with so much clearness has God stamped his being upon the outward creation. We learn from such induction, therefore, that God is All-wise and All-powerful, and of Perfect Goodness, and of Self-consistent Unity. But we turn to the moral world, and we find his wise purposes apparently thwarted and frustrated by human folly; his Will, irresistible elsewhere, no longer implicitly obeyed; but the will of man seemingly of paramount influence in the destiny of his race. Divine Goodness is called in question by the natural man; and his Justice taxed with blindness, by reason of the successes of vice, and the rebuffs and adversities of virtue. These apparent incongruities have in every age of the world caused the fool to say 'in his heart, There is no God;' and the less daring sceptic to throw a doubt upon the decisive warnings of Scripture, and to ask, 'Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.' Nay, even the believing heart may not always be free from harassing doubts, and inward misgivings; 'I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked.' 'They are not in trouble as other men; neither are they plagued like other men.' 'Behold, these are the ungodly, who prosper in the

2 Pet. iii. 4.

Psal. lxxiii.
3, 5, 12, 16,
17.

world; they increase in riches.' 'When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me; until I went into the sanctuary of God; then understood I their end.' But notwithstanding present hardships, and crosses, and trials, the language of a true faith will still be the same; 'Verily there is a reward for the righteous; verily there is a God that judgeth the earth.' All those difficulties and apparently inconsistent dispensations of Providence that lead others to call in question the Goodness and Justice of God, are to the believing soul an irresistible argument for the necessity of that future Judgment, of which the Bible so surely speaks. For if this life is a life of trial and discipline for another, we need nothing more to vindicate the goodness, and truth, and justice of God; or to make out a complete proof that they are as fully patent in the moral as in the natural world. But the moral nature of man gives ample evidence of this state of discipline. When the fall had changed man's will and moral constitution, so that conformity to good ceased to be the spontaneous instinct of his nature, every passion and feeling of his heart, and every faculty of his soul, required to be controlled by an effective check, lest the depraved will should lord it over the whole moral being, and render the confusion wholly irreparable. Hence, to teach an implicit reliance upon God, man has been left to devise, in theory at least, every imaginable method to regain the power of self-control, and to break the reign of evil. And this would seem to have been permitted, that the

Moral
proof of
future
judgment.

Psal. lvi. 11.

Moral
proof of
future
judgment.

ineffectual character of human effort, independently of divine grace, might be fully proved. For the two thousand years that intervened between the Deluge and the day of Christ, men were left to themselves, to achieve, if they could, the emancipation of the will from evil. This was really the aim of every system of heathen philosophy; whether enounced by Hierophants of Egypt, or by the Magi of Zabanism; by the sages of the Academy and Porch, or by the schools of Rome. But one and all they were proved to be wholly ineffective for man's regeneration. And even the Divine Law, delivered by Moses, demonstrated the inability of man to break the power of evil by his own strength. It imposed a restraint upon the actions, but left the corrupt will to fret against the bond; it had been added because of transgressions; but transgressions still made it a burthen, that the spirit, conscious of God's higher requirements, found it difficult to bear. Now the very existence of a state of trial, which this struggle with evil involves, is Nature's proof of the necessity for a day of future retribution. The fall has not so wholly eclipsed the glory of God's presence in the soul, but that the natural man may perceive within some traces, at least, of the good and perfect will of God. And the final sentence may justly be the correlative of his obedience or disobedience to that inner light. 'He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?' The words of the

son of Beor¹ were a clear proof, either that the traditional knowledge of God's will had not wholly passed away from the tribes of his people in Mesopotamia; or that human nature, even in an undisciplined state, still inherited a sufficient degree of light to discover it in some measure. But in any case, they confirm the words of St Paul, and shew, that the Gentiles possessing no immediate revelation of the divine will, may, to a certain extent, 'do by nature the things of the law,' and 'shew the work of the law written on their hearts.' Imperfect in degree as the light, vouchsafed to the tribes of the earth at large, may have been without the Gospel, still it has been sufficient to constitute life that state of present discipline, which is altogether essential to the idea of the righteous judgment of God hereafter. And benighted as is the condition of such a people, yet in whatever degree they have possessed a glimmering of light, in the same degree they die as they have lived, amenable to the Judge of all for their use of it.

Moral
proof of
future
judgment.

Rom. ii. 14,
15.

But 'to whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more;' and we at least, under the Gospel, are certain that 'for every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment.'

Luke xii. 48.

Matt. xii.
37.

¹ We may imagine the position and authority of Balaam in the tribes of Mesopotamia, from whence he was summoned by Balak, Num. xxiii. 7, to have been very similar to

that of Jethro among the Midianites, (see p. 200), namely, that of hereditary priest and ruler of a nomadic people. The words are apparently quoted as his by Micah.

Minute For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.' Not only shall a strict account be rendered of the deeds done in the body; not only shall the words of the mouth be weighed, and for good or for evil laid to our charge; but the very thoughts of our hearts, which are nothing else than the ripened and stored harvest of former words and former deeds, and which contain within themselves the seed of the future, shall be laid bare before the assembled multitude of men and angels, in that day when 'the thoughts of many hearts shall be revealed.' And this fully as much as any other consideration strikes a deep sense of religious fear into the soul, when it attempts to pierce into futurity, and to realise to itself the solemnity of the Last Judgment. It is not the belief that the present, in the just purposes of God, is so closely linked with a future issue, that overwhelms the soul with awe; but the certainty that God's justice is so minutely exact, so scrupulously faithful to its own being, as to mark down every thought, and word, and deed, of the meanest responsible life, as well as of the loftiest and most ennobled spirit; that his scrutiny is at all times so unerring, as to trace out and unravel all those complicated clues and threads of intent, that, from the beginning, have formed the mazy net-work of the history of Man's spirit.

Luke ii. 35.

And if we consider the ages of the world, that strike the mind as so vast when viewed in relation to our own brief span, and set beside them 'the

days of heaven,' what a mere speck is the whole and exact.
 life-time of the world; insignificant, as a grain of
 sand only, on the shores of eternity. But what
 a marvellous tissue of events and passions and
 crimes, of redeeming virtues also and graces
 does it involve; and yet the complication is open
 and clear as day to God's all-seeing eye. And of
 that whole which is temporal, take one separate
 atom and estimate the actions performed by one
 individual of our race in a single day, how small a
 proportion they bear to the whole compass of
 deeds done in time; yet God is just, and his eye
 unerring; and he has accurately weighed and
 balanced every principle of the heart, that has
 been called into play; and accordingly as the
 Spirit of Christ, or the spirit of disobedience has
 been the latent spring of conduct, does every
 action and word and thought of that single day,
 stand surely redeemed from evil, or as surely con-
 demned. Hence the necessity of the thorough
 renovation of man's will, of which the Bible speaks.
 In this respect, as in every other, Christ himself is
 our perfect pattern, 'I came from heaven not to John vi. 38.
 do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me.'
 'I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father John v. 30.
 which hath sent me.' And in the same way it must
 be as the daily meat of the disciple to do his John iv. 34.
 Lord and master's will. This is the meaning of
 such passages in the Bible as charge us, 'What-
 soever ye do, do all to the glory of God;' 'What-
 soever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name
 of the Lord Jesus;' 'Whatsoever ye do, do it hear-

The great
proof

tilly, as to the Lord.' And the necessity for keeping such precepts closely in view, and acting upon them with an honest consistency of purpose, is the certainty, that they represent to us the standard, whereby every thought and action will be estimated; whether they be sanctified by the Spirit of Christ, or whether they bear the broad stamp of 'the carnal mind at enmity with God.' The great practical application, therefore, of the doctrine of a future judgment, is, that we should 'bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ,' and that we should be conformed ever more and more to the pattern of him who is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person; for that alone which is redeemed by the grace of Christ shall survive the fires of the last day; and that alone shall be found to possess the attribute of eternal life.

Rom. viii. 7.

2 Cor. x. 5.

The more enlightened heathen, aware that they were amenable to a moral tribunal of a higher and more severe justice than that whereby human laws are administered, considered conscience to be the judge of man's actions, and the avenger of his delinquencies. And the delegated power of the guilty conscience to punish, as with a scourge of vipers, is clearly traced back in heathen mythology to the original authority of the One First Cause, in the term from which the name of the Furies was derived; for these terrible agents of divine castigation for good, were the offspring of the mild and merciful, being ἀπὸ τοῦ Εὐμενοῦς, Εὐμενίδες. With us conscience may be a faithful

witness, but it is Christ who exercises the supreme judicial authority over the soul. He is the inner light of every man that cometh into the world, and that is called to a state of salvation. His Spirit is vouchsafed to us as our guide through life. His holy example is bequeathed to us for our only imitation. His word is commended to our love, to be inwardly assimilated as the daily sustenance of the soul. And it is only as a man's will is reclaimed by these means, and brought into harmony with the will of God, that Christ is formed within, and the new man is raised up. But 'if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His,' and the light rudely quenched, the Holy Spirit continually grieved, the word of God disobeyed, the example of Christ set at nought, and his precious blood shed in vain, will constitute the terrible but unfailing elements of man's indictment at the last day.

Hence the practical nature of the faith that justifies, is nowhere seen more clearly, than in the various passages of Scripture, that speak to us of the measures of the final judgment. Of those that die in the Lord it is said that 'their works do follow them.' Deeds of mercy and loving-kindness, we are assured, will be accepted by the Judge of the spirits of all men, as deeds done personally to himself; while the absence of such external proofs of inward grace will be punished everlastingly, as a sure evidence that the light within hath become darkness. 'The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.'

of Faith
and
Practice.

Matt. xvi. 27.

Faith It is not that good deeds in themselves should earn for man an eternal reward ; or that the negative condition of their non-existence should demand, by reason of some natural fitness, a no less endless punishment ; but they are conclusive testimony of the grace of Christ reverently guarded within, or faithlessly driven forth ; and therefore in the outward manifestation or absence of such signs of the Spirit of Christ, the faith that justifies must either stand or fall. Thus, if we are accounted righteous before God, only on account of the merits of Christ, faith being the means whereby we receive our justification freely offered by divine mercy ; and if without faith it is impossible that we should be justified ; faith in its turn is inseparably connected with the deeds of a regenerate spirit. Without such external proof of its living virtue and practical character, it is impossible that the faith should be genuine. Without such evidence, there may be the assent of the intellect to the truth of the Gospel ; the devils also believe in this low sense, and tremble ; but there is no obedient love, no sanctifying hope of larger and larger measures of good in such belief, and these graces a true Christian faith abundantly has ; and therefore the doctrine of our justification by faith, is perfectly consistent with that which the Bible so universally teaches ; that we shall be judged hereafter according to the deeds done in the body. It is a declaration, in other terms, that we shall be judged according to our use or abuse of Christian privilege. The faith that is shewn to be genuine,

by the Grace of Christ habitually overruling the actions of the believer's life, shall be found to be the faith that justifies; but the mere naming of the name of Christ, without doing his will, marks only the belief of the faithless and reprobate, and must be followed by the punishment of eternal exclusion from the presence of God.

and
Practice.

Luke vi. 46.

Further, since we shall be judged according to the practical results of our faith in Christ; that is, according to our loyal acceptance of Christ, and devotional obedience to His Will in the inner man, it is with a consistent harmony, that He who claims our entire allegiance in life, should be constituted our Judge after death. The words of Daniel, adopted as they were by our Lord, and applied, in their strict letter, to his own future appearance in power and great glory, exhibit to us an exact description of that which we expect most surely to witness, when the judgment shall be 'set, and the books opened.' 'I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.' An earlier indication of the same event, still hidden in the womb of time, is preserved by St Jude, as having been left on record by him who walked with God; 'Enoch also, the

All judgment committed to the Son.

Dan. vii. 10,
13, 14.

Jude 14.

Christ the
judge of
all.

seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints to execute judgment upon all.' The Lord of whom the patriarch spake, is the Lord Christ; for 'the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son.' We are very certain indeed, that it is to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that we are amenable for the use or abuse of the degree of light and privilege that we enjoy as members of Christ; but with equal certainty the Scripture declares, that the final sentence, passed upon each individual of our race, shall be pronounced by the Son of Man. And the dispensation is full of loving-kindness and pity for our weakness. Christ, doubtless, as Man, is thoroughly touched with the spirit of our infirmities. But this practical knowledge of our weakness, was in no way requisite for the righteous judgment of Him, who knoweth 'what is in man, and needeth not that any should testify of man.' As regards ourselves, however, it is indeed a blessed comfort to know, that he who shall be our judge, 'was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.' He promised to his faithful Apostles a kingdom and a pre-eminence of dignity, because they had continued with him in his trials and temptations, that is, because they had wholly sympathised with him; and he no less fully sympathises with the lowliest of his followers, and whatever the measure of his judgment may be, of one and all it is true, that 'his eye pitieth them.' The devotional language of the Church, therefore, as regards the Son, and

John ii. 25.

Luke xxii.
26, 29.

her hope has been the same from the beginning; Christ the judge of all.
 'We believe that thou shalt come to be our Judge.'

There is also a necessary congruity in the dispensation, which makes it wholly fit that the Son of Man should be our Judge. For it is morally fitting, that in the judgment upon which eternity depends, the judge should be brought home to the outward sense, even though 'the whole earth keep silence before him.' We are assured therefore, that 'every eye shall see him, and they also Rev. i. 7. that pierced him.' Christ, enthroned in glory, shall be as plainly visible to the unjust judges that condemned, as he was when arraigned as a malefactor at their bar. But 'without holiness no man shall see the Lord;' and it were morally and spiritually impossible that hearts unpurified by faith, and unsanctified by the Spirit of God, should behold the unveiled glory of the Divine Nature, even though to behold were to be consumed. 'No John i. 18. man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.' Until the final sentence is past, not even the just shall enter into the joy of their Lord, or be admitted to the immediate presence of God. Much less shall the veil, that still conceals Matt. xxv. 34. the full glories of God's presence, be removed from before the faithless; and if it be necessary that the definitive sentence should be conveyed immediately from the Judge to the unsanctified and unredeemed, this alone might assure us, that the Son of Man must be the Judge by whom the word of doom is pronounced.

Christ shall
judge

Acts i. 11.

Matt. xxiv.
30, 31.

the quick
and the
dead.

Rom. v. 12.

Heb. ix. 27.

The second Advent of Christ, then, shall be a revelation of Himself to the bodily senses of all. 'This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.' But he shall appear with an awful pomp and solemnity, such as man could scarce look upon and live. 'Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.'

The overwhelming majesty and awe of this appearance, with which mere mortal sense cannot consist, leads us to consider the third particular confessed in this article; that those subject to the final judgment shall be the quick and the dead; terms co-extensive with the whole human race. The dead shall be raised again to life, that they may be judged according to the deeds done in the body; and those that are alive upon earth at the last day, that is, the quick, shall undergo the self-same judgment. But since in Adam all die, 'Since by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;' since there is no exception declared to the decree, whereby 'it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment;' it would seem that all must fulfil the law of nature, and first cease to live, and pass on to that

dread tribunal, only through the gates of death. For when the earth shall be burned up, and the elements melt with fervent heat, the life that is of this earth, earthy, must by the same catastrophe receive its determinate period, depending, as it does entirely, upon those destructible elements for its continuance. Hence, if the dead in Christ shall be subject to the single action of being raised again to life, that they may receive their sentence; while the quick and living must first be divested of mortal life, and then undergo their change and stand before the Judge of all, we may better comprehend why St Paul should assure us, ‘that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.’ In every case we are certain, that ‘this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality;’ and this universal law applying to all alike, the dead shall live again, and first rise and be summoned to judgment, while the living must be divested of this mortal life, before their change can come ‘in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye.’ The words of the Apostle therefore, and indeed the voice of Scripture throughout, are so clear upon the point, that the end shall come at a time,

the quick
and the
dead.

² Pet. iii. 10.

¹ Thess. iv.
15—17.

The quick
and the
dead.

when the earth is still peopled by a living generation, that we need not consider any other interpretation which these words of the Creed have sometimes received. It is evident that the term, 'quick,' exactly corresponds with those of whom St Paul speaks, as being alive at Christ's coming, while the correlative expression, 'the dead,' is as certainly involved in those 'that sleep;' the 'dead in Christ,' applying only to bodily death. Since also it is impossible that heaven and earth should pass away at that day, without the extinction of every spark of animal life in the beings then existent upon the earth, it would appear to be a matter of physical necessity, at least if the laws that bind our nature since the fall be not then reversed, that the last generation of the human race should cease to breathe, and that, in their case also, the body should be separated from the soul, to be reunited again by the quickening power of Christ, preparatory to his righteous judgment.

Whose
Kingdom
shall have
no end.

The Nicene Creed, having stated that the Son of God was begotten of the Father before all worlds; that is, from all eternity; and having defined the nature of the Son to be God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; having further declared the commencement in time of the human nature of Christ, by a holy Incarnation and Nativity; concludes the theological definition of faith in Christ with the statement, 'whose kingdom shall have no end.' The bearing which these words were intended to have, was, no doubt, in con-

demnation of the Sabellian notion, that the Son was merely an emanation from the Deity, without distinct personal subsistence; put forth for a time, and reabsorbed again into the entire substance of the Deity, when the object of his mission had been achieved. As therefore, in the preceding part of the Creed, the antagonistic heresy of Arius had been pointedly condemned, in the several articles that define the Catholic Faith of the Son's generation from the Father; to all of which terms Sabellius would without difficulty have assented; so at the close of the expression of faith in the great mystery of godliness, this assertion is made of the eternity of Christ's Kingdom; whereby the believer is guarded against the distinctive error of Sabellianism¹, the temporary emanation and subsequent reabsorption of the Son into the substance of the Father. It is of the Mediatorial kingdom alone that St Paul speaks, when he affirms that the end shall be, when Christ 'shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father,' 'that God may be all in all.' When he 'that opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God,' shall have been finally and for ever

The nega-
tion of
Sabellian
error.

1 Cor. xv. 24.

2 Thess. ii. 4.

¹ It was with a distinct reference to the same heresy that the Aquileian creed opens with a declaration of faith in God the Father Almighty, 'Invisible and Impassible,' so Rufinus informs us, 'His additur invisibilem et impassibilem. Sciendum quod duo isti sermones in Ecclesiæ Romanæ symbolo non habentur. Constat autem apud nos additos hæreseos causa, Sabelli illius profecto, quæ a nostris Patripassiana

appellatur; id est, quæ et Patrem ipsum, vel ex virgine natum dicit et visibilem factum esse, vel passum affirmat in carne. Ut ergo excluderetur talis impietas de Patre, videntur hæc addidisse majores, et invisibilem Patrem atque impassibilem dixisse. Ruff. *de Symb.* 5; *Vind. Cath.* i. 559. The absence of all reference to this heresy is another proof of the primitive antiquity of the Roman Creed.

Whose
Kingdom
shall have
no end.

vanquished, never again to imperil the salvation of Christ's people; then the Mediatorial throne of Christ shall also cease; for it will no longer have any office to fulfil, all things being 'subject to God, even the Father.' But the kingly throne of Christ is eternal in Glory and Power, as the angelic annunciation declared from the first moment of the Incarnation; 'Of his kingdom there shall be no end;' and as St John heard in his heavenly vision, 'The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever.' Manifestly therefore, this article of the Nicene Creed, which is common also to other primitive creeds, in no way militates against the words of the Apostle, that
 Luke i. 33. 'the Son also shall be subject to Him that put all things under him.' When redemption is complete, the Redeemer's office will be at an end; but from all eternity the decree hath gone forth, and to the Son it hath been said, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.'

Rev. xi. 15.

pp. 53, 64.

1 Cor. xv. 28.

I BELIEVE IN THE HOLY GHOST.

The baptismal formula of faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, having been made the basis for a wider exhibition of evangelical fact in the Creed; and the various intervening articles, relating to the Son, having disjoined the Holy Spirit from the opening confession of faith, the predicate from its copula and subject, these are again repeated, which in the original concise form was

unnecessary, and the words are set down at length, I believe in the Holy Ghost. Generally, however, the Creeds of the East retained the elliptical pp. 62, 64, 69, 74. character of the baptismal formula, and the expression of faith made in the first words of the Creed being carried on in sense, this clause merely expressed, 'and in the Holy Ghost.' The Latin versions also of the Nicene Creed are rendered in the same elliptical manner; but in our English translation the words 'I believe,' were added to fill out the meaning. Upon this article, it will be necessary, first, to exhibit the Scriptural proof of the Divinity and Personality of the Holy Ghost; secondly, the mode of his personal subsistence, by Procession from the Father and the Son; and, thirdly, to exhibit the co-ordinate relation of the Holy Spirit, in glory equal, in Majesty co-eternal.

I. First, when the world was called into existence, it was by the operation of God, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. 'In the beginning, God created the heaven and earth;' and we know most surely that this involves the manifestation of God the Father's Almighty power. But by reason of the Unity of the Divine Nature, the Eternal Son was equally with the Father the Creator of all things, 'for what things soever the Father doeth, these John v. 19. also doeth the Son likewise.' The thoughts of a man's heart are inseparable from the suggestions of memory, or hope, or fear, the particular condition of the reasonable soul; in a far more intimate relation, and wholly ineffably, the Son is one with the Father, 'In the beginning was the Word, and

Creative
energy.

Creative
energy.

Gen. i. 2.

Regenerat-
ing energy.

Matt. iii. 17.

the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.' After the same manner the Holy Spirit is one with the Father and Son, proceeding forth as he does from the perfect Unity of the two. Thus in the morning of creation, the Holy Ghost no less than the Father and the Son, exerted a creative and plastic energy, and reduced to order, and infused a spirit of life into the senseless mass of matter; 'The earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters:' i.e. He brooded over it with a quickening energy.

Hence in St John's Gospel, which opens with a description of the spiritual creation, closely following the Mosaic account of the physical formation of the world, the Evangelist having stated the co-ordinate power and wisdom of the Father and Son, proceeds to declare the simultaneous action of the Holy Spirit in the world of grace, by placing, as the first words of the message of glad tidings, the record of John, that the Holy Ghost was seen to descend from heaven as a dove, and to abide upon the Son. Once more, the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters, but this time as the vital principle of the soul; and the Spirit of Life was known to be in Him, who is the Light of men. The history of the physical Creation, therefore, having revealed the divine energy of the Holy Spirit, the new creation in a

similar manner clearly indicates His distinct Per-^{Regenerat-}
sonality; and as the Father was known to be ^{ing energy.}
hypostatically distinct from the Son, by the testimony proclaimed from Heaven; so also the Personality of the Holy Ghost was shewn forth with equal clearness, by a miraculous and sensible descent upon the Lord of Life.

[That a current argument in proof of the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost may not seem in the sequel to have been omitted through inadvertence, it may be observed, that it is widely open to doubt whether any force ought to be allowed to the seeming enallage of gender in the texts John xiv. 26, xv. 26, xvi. 13. It has been usual to consider the masculine pronoun *ἐκεῖνος*, &c. as referring to the neuter noun *Πνεῦμα*, and to account for the enallage by considering the agreement to be logical, rather than formal; applying to the person of the Holy Ghost, and not to the word *Πνεῦμα*. But, in the first place, the Syriac dialect in which our Lord spoke, has the masculine noun ܡܢܐ for the Greek neuter *Πνεῦμα*, and there is no enallage whatever in the construction with it of ܡܢܐ, Græcè *ἐκεῖνος*. But of the three texts in which *Πνεῦμα* stands in close connexion with *ἐκεῖνος*, in two it is immediately preceded by the masculine *Παρά-*
κλητος, while in the third instance the Paraclete having been mentioned, and those three particulars set forth in which he should reprove the world of sin, and righteousness, and judgment, it is added; ‘but when He (*ἐκεῖνος*) the Spirit of Truth shall come,’ in which words *ἐκεῖνος* clearly relates to

John xiv. 26.
John xv. 26.

Divinity of
the Holy
Ghost.

Παράκλητος preceding, and not to Πνεῦμα following; the term to which the pronoun refers being explained by the synonym τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. In the other two passages also, every principle of a true philology demands, that we should connect the masculine pronoun ἐκεῖνος with Παράκλητος, and consider the term Πνεῦμα and its adjuncts to be a parenthetical explanation of that less common term; so that the passages might, in fact, be printed, 'Ὁ δὲ Παράκλητος (τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ πέμψει ὁ Πατήρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου,) ἐκεῖνος κ. τ. λ., and 'Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ Παράκλητος, ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς, (τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται,) ἐκεῖνος, κ. τ. λ.]

But a more convincing proof of the Divinity and distinct Personality of the Holy Ghost, is found in the Baptismal formula, which, by the ordinance of Christ himself, has been the keystone of the Christian Religion from the beginning; 'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' As therefore the eternal Word is God of the Substance of the Father, but distinct in Person; so also the Holy Ghost is God of the Substance of the Father and Son, but possessing also a distinct Personality as proceeding forth from them. The expression of a true faith, committed to the reverent love of the Church by Him who alone is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, teaches most truly, that as the Father and Son are God, in Substance one, in Person individually

Matt. xxviii.
19.

distinct, so also that the Holy Ghost is God, but in true personal operation and hypostatic function, co-ordinate.

Divinity of
the Holy
Ghost.

This has been the baptismal formula ever since in the Church of Christ, and the basis of her doctrine respecting the deep mystery of faith in the Holy and Undivided Trinity. So that if ever we read of the baptism of a new convert 'in the name of Jesus,' we may be sure that this expression refers in a primary sense to faith in all that Christ declared respecting things divine; and involves faith also in God the Father, and God the Holy Ghost the Comforter, of whom he spake so plainly. Thus the confession of faith in Jesus Christ the Son of God was a sufficient authority for the administration of Baptism to the Ethiopian eunuch. Thus the disciples of the Baptist at Ephesus, at a later date, 'were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus;' but we may be very sure that they were baptized also in the name of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost; for that which rendered their baptism necessary was the fact, that they had not yet received the Spirit, and had not 'so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.' As they were now instructed, for the first time, in the Christian doctrine of the Divine Energy and Office of the Comforter, Baptism in that newly-revealed name, in accordance with the Saviour's command, was the necessary result. Possibly, however, 'Baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus,' may have reference to the baptismal engagement rather than to an assertion of baptismal faith. It was in this

Acts viii. 37.

Acts xix. 5.

One in the
Divine
Unity.

Rom. vi. 3, 4.

Col. ii. 12, 13.

Gal. iii. 27.

1 Pet. iii. 21.

One in the
Divine
Unity.

aspect more than in any other that St Paul regarded baptism. 'Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.' 'Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses.' 'As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.' So also St Peter, 'Baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.' In this way, to be reminded of our baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus, is, to use the words of our Church, to remember 'that baptism doth represent unto us our profession; which is to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto him; that, as he died, and rose again for us, so should we, who are baptized, die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness.'

Further, as the Unity of God the Son with God the Father was declared by our Lord in those expressions, that serve to shew an unity of volition and action, the similar terms applied to the Holy Spirit declare also his unity with them, as the third Person in the holy and undivided Trinity.

For we have seen, that one proof of Christ's Divinity has been deduced by Chrysostom from the various expressions of unity of will with the Father, that are exhibited in the Gospel of St John; and by like reasoning he shews that the Holy Ghost is God, and personally distinct from the Father and Son. "Whatsoever things I speak, these he also speaketh." But when our Lord says he shall not speak of himself, he means, nothing at variance with, nothing apart from my doctrine; wherefore, as when in allusion to himself he says, "I say nothing of myself," and means, nothing exclusively of the Father, nothing apart from him and peculiar to myself; thus also doth he speak of the Spirit. But the term, of mine, signifies, of that which I know, of my own knowledge; for my own knowledge and the knowledge of the Spirit are identical!'

One in the
Divine
Unity.

pp. 137—139.

John xii. 49.

It is expressly stated, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father; 'When the Comforter is come, ... which proceedeth from the Father;' and there are passages which, virtually involving a simultaneous procession from the Son, set forth at the same time that *ὁμόνοια*, which has already been shewn to establish the substantial Unity of Father and Son. So, if the Son declares, 'I came forth from the Father,' he also promised that

John xv. 26.

¹ Ἄπερ οὖν εἶπον ἐγὼ ταῦτα κακείνος ἐρεῖ· ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ οὐδὲν αὐτοῦ λαλήσει, οὐδὲν ἐναντίον οὐδὲν ἰδίον παρὰ τὰ ἐμά φησιν. Ὡς περ οὖν περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγων, ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐ λαλῶ, τοῦτό φησιν ὅτι οὐδὲν ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς, οὐδὲν ἰδιόν

τι παρ' ἐκείνου καὶ ἀλλότριον, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος. τὸ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ, ἐξ ὧν ἐγὼ οἶδα, ἐκ τῆς ἐμῆς γνώσεως, μία γὰρ ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος γνώσις. Chrysost. in Joh. xvi. 15.

- One in the Divine Unity. the Comforter should come forth from Him, for he speaks of the Spirit as proceeding from the Father, but sent forth immediately by Himself;
- John xiv. 26. 'It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you;' just as He elsewhere promised, 'I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you.' So also if Philip was assured, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,' in the same way, he that hath known the Son hath known the Spirit; for while Christ was still present with his Apostles in the flesh, and
- John vii. 39. 'the Holy Ghost was not yet given,' the Saviour declared of the Comforter, 'But ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.' And those words that seemed at first to be so wholly involved in obscurity, had reference to His own
- John xiv. 17. identity of substance with the Holy Ghost; 'A little while, and ye shall not see me; and again, a little while, and ye shall see me; because I go to the Father.'
- John xvi. 16.

Again, if our Lord established his unity with the Father, by exhibiting identity of will, the Holy Spirit has conveyed the manifestation of that blessed will, from the time that Christ breathed on his Apostles, and conferred upon them the Holy Ghost. Of Himself He says, 'I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak.' And of the Holy Spirit it is stated, with a like expression of the truth, that the Ascension of Christ took place 'after that

John xii. 49.

Acts i. 2.

he through the Holy Ghost had given command-
 ments unto the Apostles whom he had chosen.' One in the
Divine
Unity.
 Elsewhere, as having been from all eternity in the
 bosom of the Father, the Son declares, 'The John v. 20.
 Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things
 that himself doeth;' and 'all things that the John xvi. 15.
 Father hath are mine;' but the same truths are
 applied to the Holy Spirit; 'The things of God 1 Cor. ii. 10,
11.
 knoweth no man but the Spirit of God;' 'the
 Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of
 God.' 'Therefore said I that he shall take of mine, John xvi. 15.
 and shall shew it unto you.' In the same way, if
 of the Son we read, 'As my Father hath taught John viii. 28,
29.
 me, I speak these things, and he that sent me
 is with me;' in like manner it is affirmed of the
 Holy Ghost, 'The Comforter, which is the Holy John xiv. 26.
 Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he
 shall teach you all things, and bring all things to
 your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto
 you.' Of the Son again it is said, that he 'can do John v. 19.
 nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father
 do: for what things soever he doeth, these also
 doeth the Son likewise;' and 'He that sent me is John viii. 26.
 true; and I speak to the world those things that I
 have heard of Him;' while in a similar way it
 is asserted of the Comforter, 'When he, the Spirit John xvi. 13.
 of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth:
 for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever
 he shall hear, that shall he speak.' Christ also
 is our 'advocate with the Father;' 'I pray for 1 John ii. 1.
 them . . . which thou hast given me . . . that thou
 shouldest keep them from evil . . . neither pray I

One in the
Divine
Unity.

John xvii. 9,
15, 20.
Rom. viii. 26,
27.

for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word.' And no less true is it, that 'the Spirit also maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.' Further, it is the will of God, that all 'men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father;' but he that dishonoureth the Holy Ghost, by an obstinate infidelity, is guilty of the blasphemy that is irremissible. Wilful blindness is the most hopeless state of the evil heart of unbelief. It was the condition indicated in the five brethren of Dives; 'If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.' It marked the benighted character of the Pharisees; 'If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth.' And in every age of the Gospel, it denotes the wretched state to which a vain presumption and conceit of intellect condemns the infidel spirit. If then prayer and fasting mark the discipline, whereby spirits of a fouler cast can alone be driven forth, where is the likelihood, that the demon of wilful unbelief, that 'exalteth himself above all that is called God,' should ever be cast forth from the heart that gives him admittance? 'Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a

John v. 23.

Luke xvi. 31.

John ix. 41.

2 Thess. ii. 4.

Matt. xii. 31,
32.

word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.' Lastly, if it is true of the Son, that, by virtue of his personal generation from the Father, whatsoever the Father doeth, that doeth the Son likewise; and 'as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will;' so also is it true that in the world of grace the Holy Ghost, which proceedeth from the Father and the Son, displays his own personal energy and subsistence, in dispensing variously the manifold grace of God; 'There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all.' 'But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.'

One in the
Divine
Unity.

John v. 21.

1 Cor. xii.
4-6.

1 Cor. xii. 11.

That this last passage gives a very decided testimony to the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, a few words of explanation will serve to shew. The exercise of miraculous gifts is especially referred in Scripture to the operation of the third person in the Holy Trinity; the Apostle's words in this place declare plainly that the Author of these good gifts is God. The gifts are enumerated, which the Spirit divideth to every man severally as he willeth; and the sacred writer is especially careful to point out, that all these gifts are dispensed by the one and selfsame Holy Spirit of

Other
proofs of
Divinity.

God. For in the general terms whereby these gifts are classed before they are specified in detail, they are referred to the gracious influence of God the Holy Ghost. 'There are diversities of gifts,' are the Apostle's words, 'but the same Spirit;' and the *χαρίσματα* are immediately afterwards designated as the word of wisdom, the word of knowledge, and faith; gifts that are of immediate service to the possessor. Then it is added, 'there are diversities of administrations, but the same Lord;' and since the administration of any good involves the blessing of many, the *διακονίαι* are enumerated, the collation of which is mediately for the good of others; such as gifts of healing, and the working of miracles. But He that is Spirit and Lord is next declared to be God; for St Paul proceeds to say, that 'there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God, which worketh all in all;' and the *ἐνεργήματα*, peculiarly ascribed elsewhere in Scripture to the energy of the Holy Ghost, and here referred to the same God who is the source of all good, are then set down in order: as prophecy, which was always the peculiar manifestation of the Spirit; and the discerning of spirits; the gift of tongues, with their interpretation; and all these signal endowments, which are by the gift, administration, and operation of one Spirit, Lord, and God, are dispensed by the self-same Almighty and Divine Spirit, to each ministerial recipient, severally as he willeth.

The Fathers, indeed, generally interpret this passage, as applying separately to the three persons

of the Holy Trinity. Basil¹ and Chrysostom agree in this view. But Augustine understands it to refer to the One Godhead in the unity of the Spirit. And this perhaps is the preferable explanation; limiting no independent manifestation of power to either hypostasis, but assigning a co-ordinate perfection of power and glory to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in the unity of the Spirit. In either case the proof of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost is the same. It is also observable that there is no single demonstration of Divine Power contained in this passage that is not elsewhere referred to the operation of the Holy Ghost. So the² administration of spiritual powers for the good of the Church, here ascribed to the Lord, is elsewhere attributed to the Spirit, ‘How shall not the ministration (δια-
κονία) of the Spirit be rather glorious?’ And the same Apostle, after recounting the various gifts of the Spirit which Christ received for men when he ascended up on High, says that they were poured forth, ‘for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry,’ εἰς ἔργον διακονίας; and to the Hebrews he says, that the word of salvation was first preached by those who heard the Lord; ‘God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will;’ whereby we may know that the diversities of administrations assigned to the Lord in the first Epistle to

Other
proofs of
Divinity.

² Cor. iii. 8,
17, 18.

Eph. iv. 12.
Heb. ii. 4.

¹ *De Sp. S.* 27. *Vind. Cath.* i. 16, al. 26.

382. Chrysost. *1 Cor.* xii. 5. Augustine, *Serm.* LXXI. in *Matt.* xii. c.

² See Basil *de Sp. S.* 39. *Vind. Cath.* i. 387.

- Other proofs of Divinity.
- Acts xxi. 11. the Corinthians, are by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Again, if spiritual gifts, in any one aspect more than another, are referred to the Holy Ghost in Scripture, it is as they are manifested in the miraculous application, or control of the natural faculties of the human mind. So 'Prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' And the most usual evidence of the illapse of the Holy Ghost in the Apostolic age, was that the recipients spake with tongues. Also if the discerning of spirits was one of those *ἐνεργήματα*, that the Apostle refers peculiarly to God, that same discrete inspiration was vouchsafed by the Holy Ghost, when Barnabas and Saul were separated for the work whereunto they were called by that same Spirit, who knew what was in man, and discerned their fitness for the work; 'And they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost departed.' The conclusion therefore, from 1 Cor. xii. 4—11, is sure and good, that the Holy Ghost is God, and equally, with the Father and the Son, the source of every good and perfect gift.
- Acts xiii. 4.
- James i. 17.

Other texts also declare the Divinity and distinct Personality of the Holy Ghost. For instance, in the Annunciation of the Word made flesh, the angel Gabriel, having first communicated the marvellous truth, that the human nature of Christ should be derived from the Virgin by the operation of the Holy Ghost, proceeded to declare; 'Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.' The Son

of God the Divine Word had existed from all eternity in the glory of the Father; the creative energy of the Holy Ghost in time, could not invest Him with a title that had been his own by an everlasting inheritance; but the human nature of Christ was wholly derived from the Blessed Virgin, and a living individuality was conferred upon it by the Holy Ghost, at the same time that the Divine Word was conjoined with it. When therefore, by reason of that miraculously quickened life, the holy child Jesus, no less than the Word, was called the Son of God, we possess in this fact alone sufficient authority for adoring the Holy Ghost, the author of that life, as God.

Other
proofs of
Divinity.

Again, the awful punishment of Ananias and his wife, was a sure proof of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. They were persons 'of corrupt mind, 1 Tim. vi. 5. destitute of truth,' hoping that godliness might be to them a matter of gain. They endeavoured to turn to a profitable account their adoption of the new religion; for having sold a possession, at a time when the brethren had all things in common, they 'brought a certain part, and laid it at the Apostles' Acts v. 2. feet;' but kept back more than they brought; hoping to gain a fraudulent credit, as disinterested members of the infant church, and to profit by the distribution that was 'made to every man Acts iv. 35. according as he had need,' and yet to retain a private fund of their own. The gracious absence of all self-seeking covetousness, that was the distinctive phase of early Christian society, gave a peculiar scope to those diversities of administration, which were by the operation of the Holy Ghost.

Other
proofs of
Divinity.

The sin, also, of which this wretched man and his wife had been guilty, was a sin committed more especially against the spirit of brotherly love and charity, the godly instinct inspired by the Holy Ghost; and it was accordingly laid to the charge of Ananias by the Apostle, as a crime against the Majesty of the Holy Ghost and of God. 'Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?... Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God;' while the partner of his crime was charged with the complicity of agreeing together with him 'to tempt the Spirit of the Lord.' It may be seen therefore, from this fearful judgment of the lying spirit, that the only meaning which the Church of the Apostolic age could have attached to the formula of Baptism, the subjective basis of the entire Creed, was that as the Father is God, and the Son is God, so also that the Holy Ghost is God.

It was a sin of the same complexion that was imagined by Simon Magus, though, foul as it was, and full of dishonour to the Holy Spirit, not instantly avenged, when, after his baptism, he offered money to the Apostles, that he might be invested with the power of dispensing the miraculous gifts of the Spirit; hoping doubtless like Ananias, that the religion of Christ might be made to him an after-source of traffic and gain. And it may be observed that the disposal of the gift of the Holy Ghost was the object coveted; while the gift of God is used as its synonym in the cutting rebuke of the Apostle. 'Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost. But Peter said unto him, Thy

money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money.' And the terms used in the sequel by St Peter, shew the near approach made by this request to the sin against the Holy Ghost that never can be forgiven, 'Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if ever the thought of thine heart be forgiven thee.' The subsequent history also of this wretched impostor exhibits the secret causes that detain a man under the bondage of the deadliest sin against God; sin that inflicts a judicial blindness, and is so hopeless because it is wilful. For what indeed was the remaining history of this lost spirit, but one tangled web of blasphemy and arrogance; of self-conceit and sensualism. His course exhibits a fearful exposition of the reasons why the sin against the Holy Ghost is so wholly without pardon either in this world or in the world to come.

Simon
Magus.

Acts viii. 22.

ἐλ ἄρα
ἀφεθῇ-
σεται.

The Divinity and distinct personality of the Holy Ghost then are demonstrable, by his presence in the beginning of all things, when God created the heaven and the earth; in his descent from heaven upon Christ, when the simultaneous voice of the Father from the eternal throne, gave sensible proof to the Baptist of the individual existence of each Person in the Blessed Trinity. The same testimony, again, which was vouchsafed in the Baptism of her Lord, has been faithfully preserved and handed down by the Church ever since; and generation after generation of believers have been placed in the path of Salvation by Baptism in the

Recapitu-
lation.

Recapitu-
lation.

name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. So also, evangelical expressions that exhibit so convincingly the unity of will and substance of Father and Son, find their parallel in similar statements, having reference to the divine *ὁμόνοια* of the Holy Ghost. And whereas the Scriptural evidence, that the Spirit proceeds forth from the Father, is direct and immediate ; the procession also from the Son is exhibited in a scarcely less satisfactory manner. For as the Son is one in unity of will and identity of attribute with the Father, and yet came forth from him into the world ; so the Holy Ghost is wholly one in will and attribute with the Son, and proceeds forth from Him and from the Father, as the source of every good and perfect gift. Again, in a passage which was intended by St Paul to guard a particular church against erroneous notions upon the nature and object of spiritual gifts ; and in which, for this very reason, he would be exact and particular in his definition ; the Apostle expressly states, that those peculiar manifestations of the Holy Ghost, the spiritual gifts of the Church, her administration of things pertaining to God, and the operation of miraculous powers, were all of them referrible to the energy of one Spirit, one Lord, and one God. And in the last place the signal punishment of Ananias and his wife was inflicted for uttering a wilful falsehood before God ; but the crime was committed in the face of the whole Church ; and therefore the sin which was a sore offence against the God of all truth, was peculiarly a sin against the Holy Ghost,

who is the very life of the Church, the body of Christ, which that falsehood was intended to defraud. Recapitulation.
 St Peter therefore, in convicting those sinners against their own souls, asserts indeed that they had lied not unto men but unto God, and with a more particular and personal designation, unto God the Holy Ghost.

It will be observed, upon referring to the Creed ratified by the Nicene Council, that it concludes rather abruptly with the words, ‘And in the Holy Ghost;’ and it has been the opinion of some, that the subsequent clauses, as set down at length by the Council of Constantinople, were also incorporated in the Nicene formulary, but omitted in the Acts of the Council, as irrelevant to the immediate purpose of the Synod, the condemnation of Arius and his tenets. It is certain, however, that the creed of Irenæus asserted, that the Holy Spirit ‘spake by the Prophets;’ and that we look for the Resurrection ‘of all flesh of the whole human race.’ The Creed of Gregory exhibits the Holy Ghost as the Lord and Giver of Life, ‘who with the Father and Son together is worshipped and glorified;’ the same is shewn in the Creed of Lucian the Martyr; while the other supplementary clauses of belief in the holy Catholic Church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come, are found in the similar terms of the ancient Creed contained in the Apostolical Constitutions. The same confession also forms part of the Creed of the Church of Jerusalem. Whether or not therefore, the final

Final clauses of the Nicene Creed.
p. 69.

p. 74.

p. 44.

pp. 58, 62.

p. 54.

p. 64.

Final clauses of the Nicene Creed.

p. 68.

clauses of the Nicene Creed, as we now recite them, were incorporated at Nice, or first added at Constantinople, the far higher antiquity of these clauses is very manifest. The following perhaps may be accepted as not an improbable reason for their suppression. On referring to the Epistle of Eusebius, which contains the ancient Creed of Cæsarea, the basis of the Nicene formulary, it appears that the writer sets down so much of the Creed, as completes the definition of the Holy Trinity by a confession of faith in the Holy Spirit; but he omits the remaining clauses of the Creed, in order that he may add at once in an uninterrupted logical order, that declaration of the hypostatical relation of the three persons in the Trinity, which circumstances rendered necessary, and which rose so naturally to his subject, so soon as the symbolical definition was in this respect complete. The council, therefore, whose object it was to express the orthodox faith in the consubstantiality of the Son, rather than to exhibit a general view of Christian doctrine, operating upon this fore-shortened form of the Creed, ingrafted upon it that which was required to meet the present emergency. The Cæsarean Creed however, in its full form, may well be supposed to have contained the same final clauses as the Creed of the Mother Church of Jerusalem, which ends in a very similar manner to the present Nicene Creed used in our Liturgy; and therefore, since the Nicene formulary took up so prominent a position in the formal and authoritative documents of the Church, the

p. 64.

Council of Constantinople, having added clauses to meet the heresy of Macedonius, completed the definition once more, by adding those articles that always perhaps existed in the original form, from whence it was drawn. For the present, however, it is only with expressions, that are pointedly directed against those that denied the Godhead of the Holy Ghost, that we have to do.

Final clauses of the Nicene Creed.

The heresy of Macedonius was a true sequel to the Arian frenzy. As the earlier heresy maintained that the Son was created in time, so the later error taught that the Holy Spirit was in no sense of the Divine Essence, but that it was of kindred nature with the angels, though of higher order. The orthodox faith found a powerful and zealous defender in Athanasius. His Synodal epistle to the Church of Antioch is worthy of attentive perusal. After defining the theological term hypostasis, it asserts the coequality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son; that he is neither a created¹ essence, nor of a nature foreign from that of the Father and Son, but of one and the selfsame substance and inseparable from them. The first epistle, inscribed to Serapion, contains a well sustained account of the earliest rise of the Macedonian heresy, and the particular drift of its tenets. There is something also very touching in the circumstances under which the treatise was composed, for the holy father was, at the time

The Lord and Giver of Life.

A.D. 360.

¹ Τὸ δὲ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, οὐ κτίσμα, οὐδὲ ξένον, ἀλλ' ἰδίου καὶ ἀδιαίρετον τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ

Πατρὸς. Athan. *Tomus ad Ant.* 5. *Vind. Cath.* i. 132.

The Lord
and Giver
of Life.

p. 69.

that he wrote it, a fugitive in the desert, his life was in daily peril; yet even here we find him doing the work of the ministry, and throwing a shield around weaker brethren by a heroic vindication of the truth. The heresy however continued to spread, and in consequence, the second General Council was convened at Constantinople by the Emperor Theodosius, in which the Macedonian party, or Pneumatomachi, were condemned. The Creed also, promulgated by the Nicene Fathers, was now ratified, and various additions made to it, exhibiting the catholic doctrine in refutation of the Macedonian heresy. Thus, since Holy Scripture declares that the human nature of Christ, was of the substance of the Blessed Virgin, but quickened by the Holy Spirit of Life, 'for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost;' in accordance with this declaration, the Nicene Creed received a significant addition at Constantinople, whereby it was brought into a closer relation with the written word; in the earlier Creed we find it simply stated, that the Son of God 'descended for us men and for our salvation, and was Incarnate;' but in the later symbol it is declared, that He was 'Incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary.' So again the earlier Creeds generally expressed faith in the Holy Ghost, without defining the hypostatical relation that distinguishes the Spirit from the Father and the Son. The Nicene Creed also concluded with a simple statement of faith in the Holy Ghost. But the Council of Constantinople, having a definite theological purpose in view, added,

that He is 'The Lord and Giver of Life.' The Holy Ghost is Lord, for 'the Lord is that Spirit,' and the terms, Lord, and Spirit of the Lord are shewn to be convertible from the clause immediately following: 'For where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' 'In the same way, where in one Epistle the Apostle reminds the Corinthians that they are 'the temple of the living God,' in the other he changes the term for its synonym, and asks, 'Know ye not that ye are the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?' The temple is the same; it is the believer's heart; the holy inmate is also the same; but in one case it is God in an absolute sense, who is said to be there enshrined, in the other it is the same God, but specially described as the Holy Ghost. We have also seen in another passage that although there are diversities of administrations in the Church, they are dispensed by one Lord; while the context points out that the Holy Ghost was indicated by the sacred writer as that Lord. He is described to us therefore most scripturally in the Creed, as 'the Lord.' He is no less truly the Giver of Life; for so the Lord declared, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth.' In his own person he was put to death in the flesh, 'but he was quickened in the Spirit.' So St Paul says, 'The Spirit giveth life;' and 'If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.' 'He that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit

Κύριος καὶ
ζωοποιός.

2 Cor. iiii. 17.

2 Cor. vi. 16.

1 Cor. vi. 19.

John vi. 63.

τὸ ζῶσπι-
σθῆν.

1 Pet. iii. 18.

2 Cor. iii. 6.

Rom. viii. 11

Κύριος καὶ
ζωοποιός.

2 Cor. iii. 15—
18.

reap life everlasting.' As the giver of spiritual grace also, the Holy Ghost is in a peculiar sense ζωοποιούν. So the Apostle declares, in contrasting the dead letter of the Law of Moses with the living Spirit of the Gospel of Christ, whereby the spirit of man is now assimilated to the Spirit of holiness, which breathes throughout its page of Light. 'Even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.' The Commentary of Basil on this passage is beautiful and true¹; 'He therefore that riseth above the letter, in reading the Law, turneth unto the Lord, (but the Lord is now called the Spirit), and becometh like unto Moses, having his face glorified by the manifestation of God. For as objects in the vicinage of florid colouring are themselves tinted by the diffused rays; thus he who intently fixeth his regards upon the Spirit, is transformed through his glory, in a certain sense, to a more ennobled condition, having his

¹ Ὁ ἐν τῇ ἀναγνώσει τοῦ νόμου περιελών τὸ γράμμα, ἐπιστρέφει πρὸς τὸν Κύριον (ὁ δὲ Κύριος νῦν τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγεται) καὶ ὅμοιος γίνεται Μωϋσεὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον δεδοξασμένον ἔχοντι. ὡς γὰρ τὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις χρώμασι παρακείμενα, ἐκ τῆς

περιβρέουσας αὐγῆς καὶ αὐτὰ καταχρῶνται· οὕτως ὁ ἐναργῶς ἐνατενίσας τῷ Πνεύματι, ἐκ τῆς ἐκείνου δόξης μεταμορφοῦται πῶς πρὸς τὸ φανώτερον, οἷον τινι φωτὶ τῇ ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀληθείας, τὴν καρδίαν καταλαμπόμενος. καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ, μεταμορφοῦσθαι ἀπὸ

heart enlightened by the truth that is of the Spirit, as by some ray. And this is the meaning of being changed by the glory of the Spirit into our own glory; in no inefficient obscure manner, but in proportion as a man is enlightened by the Spirit.' Κύριος καὶ
ζωοποιός.
2 Cor. iii. 18.

II. The council of Constantinople next adds, that the mode of the eternal subsistence of the Holy Spirit is by procession from the Father; manifestly in reference to those words of Christ, 'When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.' The Father indeed being one in eternal Substance, and Majesty and Glory, with the Son, it is impossible that the Holy Ghost should be confessed to be of the same indivisible Godhead, and to proceed from the Father, without involving, as the inevitable consequence, procession from the Son also. With regard then to the Personal Subsistence of the Holy Ghost, two things are declared relatively of the Father, in the words of our Lord, of which one is true also of the Son. And so close a logical affinity exists between the two ideas, that the one reality can scarcely exist without the other. 'The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name,' are words that plainly refer the mission of the Spirit to the Father; whereas the words of Christ assert, that Himself, when glorified, would send forth the Com- Who pro-
ceedeth
from the
Father.
John xiv. 26.
John xv. 26.

τῆς δόξης τοῦ Πνεύματος εἰς τὴν
οἰκείαν δόξαν, οὐ μικρολόγως, οὐδὲ
ἀμυνδρῶς· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον, ἐφ'
ὅσον ἐστὶν εἰκὸς τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Πνεύ-

ματος φωτιζόμενον. Bas. M. de
Sp. Sancto, § 52. Vind. Cath. i.
408.

Who pro-
ceedeth
from the
Father.

forter from the Father. Both the Father and the Son, therefore, are declared to us, as the authoritative source of the Holy Spirit, for the Son equally with the Father hath the power to send him forth into the hearts of his people. But it is also stated that the Spirit 'proceedeth from the Father' by virtue of this mission; it is a safe inference, therefore, that he proceedeth also from the Son, by whom he is equally sent. Neither may we lose sight of the idea of which the Substantial Unity of the Godhead is so wholly suggestive; that as the Son is One with the Father in the Eternal Nature, and the Spirit also is One in the selfsame Nature, he cannot be sent forth by both Father and Son, and proceed personally from the First, without having the same hypostatic relation to the Second. But, that it might not be thought that the Father sends the Holy Ghost, as the Source of his Being, while the Son only sends him by a delegated act of authority, not naturally his own, but derived from the Father, a sensible demonstration is given in Scripture that the Holy Ghost, as the Spirit of Christ, does in fact proceed from the Son. For the first day of our Lord's Resurrection from the dead did not pass away before Christ, standing in the midst of his disciples, 'breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.' It is as impossible to doubt, that the illapse of the Spirit, in this act of Ordination, was an object of spiritual perception to

the Apostles, as that the Descent of the Holy Ghost, in the Baptism of Christ, was sensibly made known to John. In the one case, there was most infallible evidence, that he proceedeth from the Father; in the other case, there was direct proof to the Apostles, that he proceedeth from the Son. As the Son therefore is God of God, receiving by generation the eternal substance of the Father, and every divine attribute, so also the Holy Ghost is God of God, proceeding from the Father and the Son, as from one sole indivisible source, the very Godhead, perfect and undiminished in any single ray of glory. The unity of the Holy Ghost in Will and Power with the Son, shews also unity of nature with the Father, who is in essence so wholly one with the Son.

Who proceedeth
from the
Father.

But the Personal Subsistence of the Holy Ghost by Procession from Father and Son, is a point of disagreement, which has long separated the Eastern and Western Churches. Both divisions of the Church teach indeed the same scriptural truth, and attach to the terms respectively used an idea that is wholly scriptural; the only question has been with regard to the precise terms of orthodox definition. The words of Cyril of Alexandria exhibit a fair type of the dogmatic teaching of the Eastern Church upon this point. 'But when he saith of the Spirit, He shall glorify me, holding a sound faith, we shall never say that the one Christ, the Son, as though he

¹ "Οταν δὲ λέγῃ περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος· ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει· νοοῦντες ὁρθῶς, οὐχ ὡς δόξης ἐπιθεῖα τῆς

παρ' ἑτέρου φαρὲν, τὸν ἕνα Χριστὸν, καὶ Υἱόν, τὴν παρὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος δόξαν ἐλεῖν, ὅτι μηδὲ

Who pro-
ceedeth
from the
Father.

were in need of glory from another, received glory of the Holy Ghost; for His Spirit is not greater than He, nor above Him. But since for the manifestation of His own Godhead he had made use of the Holy Spirit in the operation of mighty deeds, He says that he is glorified of Him; as much as any of us men might declare with respect to some inherent faculty or talent, that "they glorify me;" for although He be the Spirit in his own proper Personality, and be the subject of a distinct conception in the mind, in that He is the Spirit and not the Son; yet is He not for that reason separate from Him. For He is called the Spirit of Truth, and Christ is the Truth, and He emanates from Him, as in fact He does from God and the Father. Wherefore the Spirit, that wrought miracles also by the hands of the holy Apostles, after the Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ into heaven, glorified him. For He was believed in nature to be God, working as He did by his own Spirit. Wherefore also he said, He shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. And we never so express ourselves, as though the Spirit

κρείττον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ. ἐπειδὴ δὲ εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος ἐκέχρητο τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι πρὸς μεγαλουργίαν, δεδοξάσθαι παρ' αὐτοῦ φησιν· ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ καὶ τις λέγοι πᾶν καθ' ἡμᾶς περὶ τῆς ἐνοῦσης ἰσχύος αὐτῷ τυχόν, ἢ γοῦν ἐπιστήμης τῆς ἐφ' ὁπωῦν, ὅτι δοξάσουσί με. εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἔστιν ἐν ὑποστάσει τὸ Πνεῦμα ἰδικῇ, καὶ ὁῦ νοεῖται καθ' ἑαυτὸ, καθὼ Πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ οὐχ ὕψος, ἀλλ' οὖν ἔστιν

οὐκ ἀλλότριον αὐτοῦ. Πνεῦμα γὰρ ἀληθείας ὠνόμασται, καὶ ἔστι Χριστὸς ἡ ἀλήθεια· καὶ προχεῖται παρ' αὐτοῦ, καθάπερ ἀμέλει καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς. ἐνεργῆσαν τοιγαροῦν τὸ Πνεῦμα καὶ διὰ χειρὸς τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων τὰ παράδοξα μετὰ τὸ ἀνελεῖν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, ἐδόξασεν αὐτόν. ἐπιστεῦθη γὰρ, ὅτι Θεὸς κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶ, πάλιν αὐτὸς ἐνεργῶν διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου Πνεύματος, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐφάσκειν

were by an imparted good wise and mighty ; for he is All Perfect, and needeth not the addition of any good. But since He is the Spirit of the Power and of the Wisdom, that is, of the Son of God, he is that very Wisdom and Power.'

Who proceedeth
from the
Father.

The Greek Church always took its stand upon the exact terms of Scripture ; and allowed only, that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father by the Son ; and that he receiveth of the Son's ; terms that virtually declare that as the procession of the Spirit is from the Father, so also is it from the Son. The Council of Constantinople, judging that heretical cavillings would be best obviated by a rigid adherence to Scriptural expressions, declared that the Holy Ghost 'proceedeth from the Father ;' although perhaps when the present danger was passed, a spirit of sound wisdom would have been shewn, in the formal recognition of a term, which, after the lapse of almost a thousand years of discord, was at length subscribed by the Greek Patriarch, and the chief of his clergy.

The Council of Constantinople then confined itself to the precise Scriptural statement, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father ; and is silent upon the relation in which the Spirit stands to the Son ; except that 'with the Father and the Son together, He is worshipped and glorified ;' the Greek Church, therefore took its stand upon this

ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται, καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. καὶ οὐτι ποῦ φαμεν, ὡς ἐκ μετοχῆς τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστι σοφόν τε καὶ δυνατόν. παντέλειον γὰρ καὶ ἀποσδεές ἐστι παντός

ἀγαθοῦ. ἐπειδὴ δὲ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς δυνάμεως καὶ σοφίας, τουτέστι τοῦ Υἱοῦ, Πνεῦμά ἐστιν, αὐτόχρομά ἐστι σοφία καὶ δύναμις. Cyr. Al. *Ep. Synod. Vind. Cath.* i. 188.

Who proceedeth
from the
Father.

synodal definition. But while it was denied that a formal assertion of the procession of the Spirit from the Son, as from the Father, was to be enforced¹, simply because the precise term was neither to be found in Scripture, nor in the Nicene formulary of Faith; still the Greek fathers were careful to apply, in their sincere sense, those terms of Scripture that do set forth the relation of Son and Holy Spirit; and that which they refrained from asserting in form, they fully believed and taught in spirit. The Holy Ghost therefore was said by them to proceed from the Father by the Son², and to receive of the Son's, in strict accordance with the statement of Scripture, 'He shall receive of mine and shew it unto you³.'

John xvi. 14.

The Western Church however as constantly expressed her faith that the Holy Ghost, confessedly one in the divine substance, with the Son, and as Scripture expressly declares, sent forth by him,

¹ 'The ancient Greek fathers, speaking of this procession, mention the Father only, and never, I think, express the Son, as sticking constantly in this to the language of Scripture. Thus Gregory Nazianzen distinguisheth the three persons; 'Επὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ὕρων ἰστάμενοι, τὸ ἀγέννητον εἰσάγομεν, καὶ τὸ γεννητὸν καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον. *Or. i. de Filio*. And the three properties attributed to the three Persons are these, ἀγεννησία to the Father, γέννησις to the Son, and ἐκπόρευσις to the Holy Ghost. But this word ἐκπόρευσις, or the verb ἐκπορεύεσθαι, was not used by the Greeks in reference to the Son, but only as

the Scriptures speak, in relation to the Father.' Pearson. Cyril of Alexandria in his Synodal Epistle in condemnation of Nestorius, as we have already seen, makes a near approach to the statement of the Western Church.

² Archbp. Laud's *Conf. w. Fisher*, § 9. Bellarmin *de Christo*, II. 27. Bingham's *Antiq.* x. 4. Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* xxxix. 31; xlv. 48; lili. 46.

³ Tertullian at a very early date shews that the Church of the south symbolised with the Eastern rather than with the Western Churches, where he says that the Spirit is 'non aliunde quam a Patre per Filium.' *adv. Prax.* 4.

proceeded from him in the same sense as he proceeds from the Father. The exact date when this statement was first made is not known. It first appears in the Nicene Creed, as confessed by a council of Spanish bishops assembled at ¹Braccara in Lusitania; it appears in the Third Council of Toledo, when the Nicene Creed was first inserted ² in the Spanish Liturgy, ‘Quo et fides vera mani-

Who proceedeth from the Father.

A.D. 412.

A.D. 589.

Cone. Tolet.
iii. can. 2.

¹ The Creed stands as a part in the Acts of these councils, with the word *Filioque*, but it is not at all certain, that it was recited in this form by the bishops in Synod assembled. Very probably, it is the insertion, whether by design or carelessness, of some scribe. Mabillon, *De Liturgia Gallicana*, i. 3, says that the addition was not made before the time of Charlemagne, ‘Præterea in symbolo legitur additamentum *Filioque*, quod a Caroli M. tempore exordium ducit.’ But it is evident that the addition was already of old standing when the discussion upon the subject took place by his order at Aix la Chapelle. The addition was very probably made in Spain before the middle of the fifth century. There are expressions in the Epistle of Cyril Al. to John Patriarch of Antioch, that would harmonise well with the notion that the innovation had already been made. Καὶ κατ’ οὐδένα δὲ τρόπον σαλευέσθαι πρὸς τινων ἀνεχόμεθα τὴν ὀρισθεῖσαν πίστιν, ἥτοι τὸ τῆς πίστεως σύμβολον παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἡμῶν πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνελθόντων κατὰ καιροῦς. οὔτε μὴν ἐπιτρέπομεν ἑαυτοῖς, ἢ ἐτέροις, ἢ λέξιν ἀμεῖψαι τῶν ἐγκειμένων ἐκεῖσε, ἢ μίαν γοῦν παραβῆναι συλλαβὴν· μεμνημένοι τοῦ λέγοντος· μὴ μέταιρε

ῥια αἰώνια, ἀ ἔθεντο οἱ πατέρες σου· οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν αὐτοὶ οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς, δ ἐκπορεύεται μὲν ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἔστι δὲ οὐκ ἀλλότριον τοῦ Υἱοῦ κατὰ τὸν τῆς οὐσίας λόγον. Cyr. Al. *Ep. ad Joh. Vind. Cath.* i. 199. The venerable father proceeds to give scriptural proof that the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of Christ.

² For more than a century previously, this Creed had been made part of the Liturgy, by Peter Fullo, Patriarch of Antioch, as we read in the historical extracts from Theodore Lector preserved by Nicephorus. Theodor. Lect. ed. Vales. p. 566, Amstelod. 1695. Bingham, x. 4, § 17. And Timotheus, Patriarch of Constantinople, also gave it a fixed place in the Liturgy, about the commencement of the next century; for before his time, it was used only once in the year, in Holy Week, when the work of catechising new converts commenced. Τιμόθεος τὸ τῶν τριακοσίων δέκα καὶ ὀκτῶ πατέρων τῆς πίστεως σύμβολον, κατ’ ἐκάστην συναξιν λέγεσθαι παρσκευάσεν, ἐπὶ διαβολῇ δὴθεν Μακεδονίου, ὡς αὐτοῦ μὴ δεχομένου τὸ σύμβολον, ἅπαξ τοῦ ἔτους λεγόμενον πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ παρασκευῇ τοῦ θεοῦ πάθους, τῷ καιρῷ τῶν γενομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου

Who proceedeth
from the
Father.

A.D. 655.

festum testimonium habeat, et ad Christi Corpus et Sanguinem prælibandum pectora populorum fide purificata accedant.' The term *Filioque* forms also part of the creed recited in the eighth Council of Toledo.

Fleury, Hist.
Eccles. xxxix.
31.

Ibid. xlv. 8.
A.D. 809.

Roman writers, as Martin, Bishop of Rome, quote several passages from the writings of Cyril of Alexandria, in vindication of the statements of the Western Church; as Maximus observes in his epistles to Marinus. Cyril's authority was also adduced by the deputation sent to Rome by Charlemagne, after the Council of Aix la Chapelle, to consult with Pope Leo III. with respect to the propriety of continuing to chant the word, '*Filioque*,' in the Creed. Leo seemed disposed to allow the continuance of the custom, but evidently approving the Greek statement as more exact¹; since he caused the creed, without the debated word, to be engraved upon two shields of silver, and deposited as a sacred *κειμήλιον* in the church of St Peter. The Abbé Fleury here observes, 'On ne voit point que cette conference ait eu aucun fruit, et chacun demeura dans son usage. En France on continua de chanter le Symbole avec le mot *Filioque*; à Rome on continua de ne le point chanter.'

κατηχήσεων. Theodor. Lect. ed.
Vales. Amst. 563.

In both of these latter instances of course, the Holy Spirit is only stated to proceed from the Father; and the writers of the Eastern Communion continued, as firmly as ever, to maintain, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, by the Son; the Western Church to declare that the procession was from

the Father and the Son.

¹ At a later date in the same century, this insertion in the Creed was condemned as unauthorised, and in terms of some severity, by Pope John VIII.; at least, if we may accept, as genuine, the letter from John to Photius, found as an appendix to the Acts of the false Council of Constantinople, A.D. 880.

Leo was conscious that the addition of a single word to the Creed was an unwarranted assumption of the powers of the Church Catholic; but on the other hand he found himself embarrassed by the determined adherence of the Spanish and Gallican Churches to the symbolical expression of this Scriptural truth. When other causes of difference and jealousy arose, having reference to the respective jurisdiction and authority of the Pope of Rome and the Patriarch of Constantinople, aggravated as they were by the question of image-worship, this verbal difference assumed a far more formidable aspect; and the charge of heresy was unscrupulously levelled by the one community, and retorted by the other. Thus in the ninth century Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, among other *gravamina*, inveighed bitterly against the schismatical addition to the Nicene Creed. But the words of Pope Nicholas I. suggest, that the true cause of difference was to be found, in the rival pretensions of the eastern branch of the Church Catholic to supremacy; the Greek patriarch asserting, that when the imperial seat of government was transferred to Constantinople, the spiritual ascendancy of Rome also passed to the patriarch of that see. In the early rise, at least, of this controversy, worldly passion, fully as much as a jealous vigilance over the purity of orthodox definition, gave the first impulse to this future source of so much unseemly strife. In the eleventh century¹, the pope, by

Who proceedeth from the Father.

Ep. 11. Baron.
A. D. 863.
Fleury, L. 56.

A. D. 867.

A. D. 1054.

¹ Bellarmin does not hesitate to speak of the entire Greek Communion as being without the Church.

‘Quod autem apud Græcos non sit ecclesia, probamus alio modo; quia nimirum convicti sunt legitime in

Who proceedeth
from the
Father.

A.D. 1439.

his legates, formally excommunicated Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople. He refused to grant an interview to the papal legates; they laid therefore the act of excommunication upon the high altar of his church, and shaking the dust from their feet, departed. The schism between the two communions continued to cause irreparable mischief during the four next centuries; until a hollow reconciliation was effected between the Greek and Latin Churches in the Council of Florence. The document then subscribed, embraced the diacritical terms allowed by either party; and that pacific course was taken in the end, though insincerely, which might have been followed out in a more genuine spirit of charity from the first; the Latins maintaining the procession of the Holy Spirit from Father and Son, as from one sole source; but allowing the orthodoxy of the usual statement of the Eastern churches; the Greeks, subscribing to their ancient definition of faith in the procession of the Holy Ghost, but not refusing their assent to a declaration, that he proceeded from the Son equally with the Father. Still the wound was too inveterate to heal; and these terms of union gave great dissatisfaction at Constantinople, where a strong party was soon found, who refused to communi-

tribus plenariis conciliis, Lateranensi, Lugdunensi, et Florentino, de schismate et hæresi; ac præcipue de hæresi circa processionem Spiritus Sancti a Filio, quam esse manifestam hæresim, Lutherani et Calvinistæ etiam confitentur.' *De Notis Eccl.* c. 8. The words of

Archbishop Laud may occur to the reader, 'Rome in this particular should be more moderate, if it be but because this article, *Filioque*, was added to the creed by herself. 'Tis hard to add, and anathematize too.' *Conf. w. Fisher*, § 9.

cate with the betrayers of the ancient faith, who ratified the acts of the Florentine Council. The old feud was speedily revived; and when Constantinople was taken by the Turks, on Whitsunday, A.D. 1453, the Latins did not scruple to attribute the event to a judicial visitation of that Church for her doctrinal delinquency.

Who with
the Father
and the Son
together is
wor-
shipped,
and
glorified.

III. Passing on from this term, so suggestive of the humiliating thought, that man's weakness and blindness may have the power to stamp its own character upon the Church of Christ, the work of God decreed from all eternity, we next approach the concluding terms of the confession of a true faith in the Holy Spirit; whereby we declare that He, 'with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified,' and that 'He spake by the Prophets.' When our Lord commanded his Apostles to instruct in a true faith, and to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, the plain inference is that every fresh convert was to be taught that as the Father and God of all is to be worshipped, so also that the Son and Holy Spirit are to be worshipped and glorified, three Persons and One God. Divine worship was paid to the Son from the beginning; even in the time of our Lord's earthly ministry, men could not refrain from worshipping him, when they were either led to him by the eternal Father, or beheld the august acts, and outward manifestation of his godlike love. And much more did he become an object of worship, when the greatest proof of his Divinity had been

Is wor-
shipped.

Heb. i. 3, 6.

shewn in his Resurrection from the dead; so that the most hardy in his unbelief, was then compelled to acknowledge the risen Saviour as his Lord and his God. And when Christ ascended up again to heaven, the prophetic declaration of King David was verified; and that which the eternal Father, through the Spirit, had uttered, was comprehended, 'Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;' 'And let all the angels of God worship him.' As regards the Son, to be baptized in His name, bound the disciple to worship Him, even as he worshipped God the Father; and since the two are wholly one, the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, proceeding forth from them as from the very source of unity, is God of the self-same substance, and equally an object of divine worship. 'Wherefore the Holy Ghost is also inseparable in worship and glory from the Father and the Son; for if you are alien to him, neither will you worship Him at all; but being in Him you will no way separate him from God; no more indeed than dissociate the idea of light from things visible¹.'

And
glorified.

The Council of Constantinople also adds, as the Confession of the Church Catholic, that the Spirit is associated with the Father and the Son in glory, and that as we worship the Holy Ghost, so also that we glorify him.

¹ Διὸ καὶ ἐν τῇ προσκυνήσει ἀχώριστον ἀπὸ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. ἔξω μὲν γὰρ ὑπάρχων αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ προσκυνήσεις τὸ παράπαν· ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ γενόμενος

οὐδενὶ τρόπῳ ἀποχωρίσεις ἀπὸ Θεοῦ· οὐ μᾶλλον γε, ἢ τῶν ὁρατῶν ἀποστήσεις τὸ φῶς. S. Bas. M. *de Sp.* S. LXIV. *Vind. Cath.* i. 425.

In whatever way the ancient hymns and authoritative writings of the Church had ascribed glory and honour and power to the Father, and Son, the same Divine worship had also been extended to the Holy Spirit. Thus in the ancient Morning Hymn¹ of the Greek Church, the 'Gloria in Excelsis Deo,' which still forms one of the noblest portions of the Christian Liturgy, the Holy Spirit 'with the Father and Son together is worshipped and glorified.' So also St Basil quotes the evening doxology, used from time immemorial by the Church at the time of the vesper light². 'It hath seemed good to our forefathers, not to receive in silence the blessing of the vesper light, but to give thanks so soon as it appeareth. But we know not to whom we should ascribe those words of thanksgiving for the holy light. The congregation, however, still repeats the sacred words; and none accuse of impiety those that say; We praise the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit of God.' The worship, therefore, of the Holy Ghost, together with the Father and the Son, has formed a portion of the stated Liturgy of the Church at Matins and

Liturgical
proof.

¹ This hymn will be found by the reader in the original Greek, in the collection of Treatises, entitled, 'Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Vindex Catholicus,' III. 317. It is not improbable that the last words of praise recorded of the holy Martyr Polycarp, were borrowed from it; *Vind. Cath.* III. 82; that it was the hymn of Christian adoration, mentioned by Pliny; and that it was the πολυώνυμος ᾠδή, alluded to by Lucian in the *Philopatris*.

² Ἐδοξε τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν μὴ σιωπῇ τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἑσπερινοῦ φωτός δέχεσθαι· ἀλλ' εὐθὺς φανέντος εὐχαριστεῖν. καὶ ὅστις μὲν ὁ πατήρ τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων τῆς ἐπιλυχνίου εὐχαριστίας, εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἔχομεν· ὁ μὲν τοι λαὸς ἀρχαίαν ἀφίησι τὴν φωνήν, καὶ οὐδενὶ πώποτε ἀσεβεῖν ἐνομίσθησαν οἱ λέγοντες· αἰνοῦμεν Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱόν, καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ. S. Bas. M. de Sp. S. LXXIII. *Vind. Cath.* I. 440.

Primitive
proof.

Evensong from the earliest ages. In corroboration also of this, the ancient authorities cited by Basil¹ in proof of the ascription of Divine Honour to the Holy Spirit, might here be reproduced. As for instance, the words of Dionysius of Alexandria, who concludes the second book of his *Defence* with the doxology, 'Now to God the Father, and to His Son our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Ghost, be glory and power for ever and ever, Amen.' Or the yet more ancient testimony of Clement, Bishop of Rome, 'God liveth, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost.' Or the words of the historian Africanus, the precursor of Eusebius, 'We bless the Father who vouchsafeth to us his peculiar people, the Saviour of all Jesus Christ, and our Lord, to whom with the Holy Ghost, be glory and majesty for ever.' Or the hymn of the Martyr Athenogenes, when about to receive the martyr's crown, glorifying, as it would seem, the Holy Spirit of God, which vouchsafed to him strength in the hour of need. Now all these and other testimonies adduced by Basil, and taken in connexion with his words, offer a satisfactory proof, that long before the incorporation of this clause in the Creed of the Church, the Holy Spirit was worshipped and glorified. How indeed could it be otherwise, where the Church has constantly held the precious truth, that as the Son is the express image of the Person of the Father, God of God; so also that the Holy Ghost the Wisdom of God, has an eternal subsistence in the One Nature of Father and Son,

¹ S. Bas. M. *de Sp.* S. LXXI—LXXIV. *Vind. Cath.* I.

and is as inseparable from the idea of the Godhead, as light is inseparable from our notion of the sun. Primitive proof.
 Irenæus, who received his knowledge of the truth, through his master the venerable Martyr Polycarp, from the beloved disciple, says¹; ‘There ministereth unto the Father in all his works, his offspring and his image; that is, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, the Word and the Wisdom, to whom all the angels do service, and are subject.’ The Church upon earth, therefore, faintly echoes the glorious praises of heaven, when she hymns forth the Eternal Majesty of the Most High; ‘Thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father.’

One practical consideration still remains to be noticed. Nothing that we can do can add to the glory of God, or in any way affect that which is eternal and infinite in perfection. He the King of Kings and Lord of Lords is neither made more glorious by our praise, nor dishonoured by our rebellion. But in some degree the glory of God may be reflected in the heart and conduct of his sons by adoption and grace, and so far as this is true they are said ‘to glorify’ him; to ‘live to his glory;’ and to ‘be to the praise of his glory.’ Eph. i. 12.
 ‘Ye are bought with a price,’ are the Apostle’s words, ‘therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit which are God’s.’ 1 Cor. vi. 20.
 ‘Being filled with the fruits of righteousness which are by Jesus Christ,’ ‘unto the Phil. i. 11.

¹ Ministrat autem ei ad omnia sua progenies et figuratio sua, id est Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus, Ver-

bum et Sapientia; quibus serviunt, et subjecti sunt omnes Angeli. Iren. iv. 17.

Practical
meaning.

- glory and praise of God.' So in contrasting the opposite conduct of their persecutors, St Peter consoles all true-hearted followers of Christ with the words; 'The Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you; on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified.' The converse also is true, and man's natural condition is to sin, 'and come short of the glory of God.' But such instances need not be multiplied, in all of which the leading idea is evidently the same; namely, that although the glory of God's holiness and purity is such as it is not possible for the heart of man to conceive; still, in proportion as He gives man grace to fulfil in any degree those loftiest precepts of the Gospel, whereby we are charged to 'be holy as he is holy,' to 'purify ourselves even as he is pure,' to 'be perfect as he is perfect;' in the same measure, the glory of God is reflected in the regenerate will and affections; and the believer may be 'changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the spirit of the Lord.' To act therefore upon all occasions according to the will of God is to glorify him. 'Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bring forth much fruit.' And Christ himself in the same way glorified the Father, by his own perfect obedience and fulfilment of his will, 'I have glorified thee on earth; I have finished the work, which thou gavest me to do.' The Holy Spirit also, in the exercise of his personal office of bringing in fresh believers to the faith, and fulfilling the members of Christ with all grace, glorifies the Son, even as the Son glorified the
- 1 Pet. iv. 14.
- Rom. iii. 23.
- 1 Pet. i. 15,
16.
1 John iii. 3.
Matt. v. 48.
- 2 Cor. iii. 18.
- John xv. 8.
- John xvii. 4.

Father, 'He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine and shew it unto you¹.' These statements of Scripture may serve to make it clear, how they who worship the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, are also said to glorify them; it is by the steady performance of the will of God, whereby the Father decreed from eternity the path of righteousness for his people to walk in, and called them according to his purpose, that they might 'be conformed to the image of his Son.' He is glorified therefore by their steady continuance in well-doing. And the Son is glorified by the wider extension of his kingdom over the dark places of the earth, and by a hearty and spiritual assimilation of the Word of Life, where he is already worshipped. The Holy Spirit also is glorified by the effective growth in grace of each regenerate member of Christ, according to the Spirit of holiness. His unuttered pleadings, which lie at the very source and well-spring of mercy, are 'the mind of the Spirit,' and only so far as they are allowed by man

Practical
meaning.

John xvi. 14.

Rom. viii. 29.

Rom. viii. 26,
27.

¹ See a commentary upon this text by Cyril of Alexandria in his Synodal Epistle upon the excommunication of Nestorius, § 9. It is found in the *Vind. Cath.* i. 188. The ninth anathema, subjoined to the same document, virtually declares the Procession of the Spirit from the Son, 'If any man say that the one Lord Jesus Christ was glorified in such a sense by the Spirit, as though through Him he made use of a distinct power, and received from him the faculty of controlling unclean spirits, and of fully exhibiting to men the proofs of the God-

head, and doth not declare that it was his own individual Spirit, whereby he wrought these proofs, let him be anathema. Εἰ τις φησὶ, τὸν ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δεδοξασθαι παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, ὡς ἀλλοτρία δύναμις τῇ δι' αὐτοῦ χρωμένον, καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντα τὸ ἐνεργεῖν δύνασθαι κατὰ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, καὶ τὸ πληροῦν εἰς ἀνθρώπους τὰς θεοσημείας, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ἴδιον αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμά φησι, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐνήργηκε τὰς θεοσημείας· ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Cyr. *Al. Ep. Synod. Vind. Cath.* i. 191.

Who spake by the Prophets. to have an effective issue in his walk with God, can he be said to glorify the Holy Spirit of God.

Lastly, it is stated in the Creed that the Holy Spirit 'spake by the Prophets;' for prophecy 'came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' Whether it consist in direct prediction of future events, or whether it mean an inspired enunciation of any Divine revelation, prophecy is ascribed by St Paul to the operation of 'the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.' Under the Old Dispensation, this gift is referred to the Spirit of God; so 'when the Spirit of God came upon Saul he prophesied.' And the Spirit of God came upon Balaam, when he beheld and blessed the goodly tabernacles of Israel, set forth 'as trees of lign aloes which the Lord hath planted.' The dream of Joseph, also, premonitory of coming evil, was an evidence to Pharaoh that the Spirit of God was in him. Under the Christian dispensation also, we find similar statements; 'Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers.' And, independently of the idea of prediction; 'David himself said by the Holy Ghost, Sit thou on my right hand.' Hence also St Stephen charged his persecutors with being true children and partakers in the deeds of their fathers, slaying the prophets and doing despite to the Spirit that spake by them; 'Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye.' But the Spirit of prophecy as

2 Pet. i. 21.

1 Cor. xii. 10, 11.

1 Sam. x. 10.

Num. xxiv. 2, 6.

Gen. xli. 39.

Acts xxviii. 25.

Acts vii. 51.

proceeding equally from Father and Son, is also termed in the New Testament the Spirit of Christ; 'The testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy,' and the prophets spake by 'the Spirit of Christ which was in them;' or, as the same writer says, 'they spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' For to prophesy, is to enounce or to interpret the will of God; 'The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?' 'No man knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God;' but 'God hath revealed them to us by his Spirit.' Whether therefore the word of prophecy be considered as referring to the revelation of futurity, or to the solemn utterance of divine truth in God's name, it is most true that the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son, spake by the prophets.

Much in the same way, whatever may have been the manifestations of God's will in the Church from the beginning, they have been effectually dispensed by his agency; and the operation of the Holy Ghost is indifferently ascribed in Scripture to the Spirit of God, and to the Spirit of Christ. Thus the long-suffering of God bore with man for many long years, before the deluge swept the whole guilty race from the face of the earth, with the exception of eight souls only; and during that season of possible conversion and repentance, still pleaded with them through the Spirit. But at length the Lord declared, 'My Spirit shall not always strive with man;' implying that hitherto, and so long as the judgment of God was still sus-

Who spake
by the
Prophets.

¹ Pet. i. 11.

² Pet. i. 21.

Amos iii. 8.

¹ Cor. ii. 10,
11.

Gen. vi. 3.

Who spake
by the
Prophets.

1 Pet. iii.
18—20.
See p. 338.

pended over the self-doomed world, the Spirit of God did strive with man, and seek to win him back from his corruption. Now, if we turn to St Peter's first epistle, we find that Christ through the Spirit preached to the men of these living generations, tied and bound as they were beneath the yoke of sin. The Spirit that strove with these earliest dwellers upon earth, therefore, proceeded forth from the Father and the Son, in Majesty equal, in glory co-eternal; comparing things spiritual with spiritual, we obtain this additional proof of the Divine Nature of the Holy Spirit, and that he is conjointly with the Father and the Son the object of worship and adoration.

The consideration of our confession of faith in the Holy Ghost, may be brought to a suitable conclusion by the words of Basil, which will serve at the same time to exhibit the pure orthodoxy of this writer, even though the Holy Spirit is nowhere said by him to proceed from the Son as from the Father; 'But what are these operations? Ineffable by reason of their vastness, innumerable in respect of multitude. For how shall we form a conception of things antecedent to the world? What were his functions before the creature of sense existed? And with how many graces is it endowed by Him? What also is his power with relation to future ages? For he was, and he pre-existed before the worlds,

¹ Αἱ δὲ ἐνέργειαι τίνες; ἀρρόητοι μὲν διὰ τὸ μέγεθος, ἀνεξαρίθμητοι δὲ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος. πῶς μὲν γὰρ νοήσομεν τὰ τῶν αἰώνων ἐπέκεινα; τίνες ἦσαν αὐτοῦ πρὸ τῆς

νοητῆς κτίσεως αἱ ἐνέργειαι; πόσαι δὲ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ περὶ τὴν κτίσιν χάριτες; τίς δὲ ἡ πρὸς τοὺς αἰῶνας τοὺς ἐπερχομένους δύναμις; ἦν μὲν γὰρ καὶ προῖν, καὶ συμπαρῆν τῷ

co-existing together with the Father, and the Son; Who spake by the Prophets. so that if you can conceive any thing anterior to the worlds, you shall find that it was subsequent to the Spirit. If you imagine the creature, the powers of heaven were stablished by the Spirit; the idea of stability applying to their habitude of unwavering constancy in good. For close union with the Deity, and a nature uninfluenced by evil, and permanence in beatitude, is that which these powers derive from the Spirit.

Is there again the Advent of Christ? The Spirit precedes. Is there His Incarnate Presence? The Spirit is inseparable from it. Are there miraculous powers, and the gifts of healing? They are by the Holy Ghost. Were devils cast out? it was by the Spirit of God. Was Satan defeated? the Spirit was also present. Are sins atoned? it is by the grace of the Spirit; for "ye are washed, ye are sanctified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost." Have we union with God? it is through the Spirit. For God hath

Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων. ὥστε καὶ τι νοήσης τῶν αἰώνων ἐπέκεινα, τοῦτο εὕρησεις τοῦ Πνεύματος κατωτέρω. ἐάν τε τὴν κτίσιν ἐβθυμῆῃς, ἐσπερώθῃσαν αἱ τῶν οὐρανῶν δυνάμεις παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος· τῆς στερεώσεως δηλονότι ἐπὶ τὸ δυσμετάπτωτον τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἕξεως νοουμένης. ἢ γὰρ πρὸς Θεὸν οἰκείωσις, καὶ τὸ πρὸς κακίαν ἄτρεπτον, καὶ τὸ ἐν μακαριότητι διαρκὲς, παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ταῖς δυνάμεσι. Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημία· καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα προτρέχει. ἔνσαρκος παρουσία· καὶ

τὸ Πνεῦμα ἀχώριστον. ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων, χαρίσματα λαμπρῶν, διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου. δαίμονες ἀπηλαύνοντο ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι τοῦ Θεοῦ. διάβολος κατηγοῖτο συμπαρόντος τοῦ Πνεύματος. ἀμαρτιῶν ἀπολύτρωσις ἐν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Πνεύματος. ἀπελούσασθε γὰρ καὶ ἡγιασθητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ. οἰκείωσις πρὸς Θεόν, διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος. ἔξαπέστειλε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, κράζον,

Who spake sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying,
by the Abba, Father. Is there the resurrection of the
Prophets. dead? it is still by the energy of the Spirit.'

Final
clauses.

The Creed having completed the definition of faith in the Holy Trinity, by asserting the Divinity and co-equality of the Holy Ghost, subjoins other clauses that partly existed in the older Creeds, but are all descriptive of our Christian privileges, and of the fulfilment of all our hope, as members of the Body of Christ, the Church. And as there is a transition here from an expression of faith in the Creator, to belief in a created reality, a corresponding change takes place in the term whereby we confess that belief. For, in confessing faith towards God, we declare that we believe in the Father, in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost; but in adding an expression of faith in those particulars that constitute the outward manifestation of the power of the Godhead among men, we enounce simply the existence of these realities, and state that we believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church, we acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins, we look for the Resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come¹. Each of these

ἀββὰ ὁ Πατήρ. ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐξανά-
στασις τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ τοῦ Πνεύματος.
Basil. M. *de Sp. S.* XLIX.

¹ 'Non dixit, in sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam, nec in remissionem peccatorum, nec in carnis resurrectionem: si enim addidisset, in, præpositionem, una cum superioribus eademque vis fieret. Nunc autem in illis quidem vocabulis, ubi de Divinitate ordinatur fides, in Deo

Patre dicitur, et in Christo Filio ejus, et in Spiritu sancto: in cæteris vero, ubi non de Divinitate, sed de creaturis et de mysteriis sermo est, in, præpositio, non additur, ut dicatur, in sancta Ecclesia; sed sanctam Ecclesiam credendam esse: non ut Deum, sed ut Ecclesiam Deo congregatam. Et remissionem peccatorum credant esse, non in remissionem peccatorum: et resurrec-

states of God's grace being referrible to the agency of the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, they find their natural place in the Creed, after a confession of faith in the Godhead of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity.

The
Church
an object
of Faith.

With regard to the first of these final clauses, the Nicene formulary declares, that the Church is Apostolic, and Catholic; while the older Roman Creed pronounces the Church to be Holy, and Catholic. We have to investigate, therefore, the true idea of the term Church, and to determine the various senses, in which the attributes of Apostolicity, Catholicity, and Holiness are predicated of it.

I. Now that we may form a just estimate of the full depth of meaning involved in the term Church, we should remember, in the first place, that its origin is not in time, but that its foundations were laid firm and sure in the eternal counsels of God; to belong to it, is to have 'fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ...according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.' The marvellous scheme of man's redemption, predestined from everlasting, and described by the Apostle as 'the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory,' was, in fulness of time, made known; and the Church, the depository

Eph. iii. 9—
11.

1 Cor. ii. 7.

tionem carnis credant, non in resurrectionem carnis. Hac itaque præpositionis syllaba, Creator a cre-

aturis secernitur, et divina separantur ab humanis." Ruffin. *de Symb.* § 36. *Vind. Cath.* i. 579.

The body
of Christ.
Eph. iv, 12.

of that all-wise counsel of God, was fore-ordained as 'the body of Christ,' 'the fulness of him that filleth all in all.' Accordingly, these two evangelical facts are laid down in the Word with great clearness: that the Church is the Body of Christ; and, that it exists by an eternal decree.

It is impossible, indeed, to read St Paul's writings with care, without being vividly impressed with the living truth, that Christ, through the Spirit, is as verily and truly head of the Church, whether visible and militant on earth, or invisible and triumphant in heaven, as that the seat of intelligence, and the source of volition, the head, directs every action, and controls the animal impulses of the body¹.

Eph. i. 23.

As therefore the head and subordinate members form one person in a bodily sense, so the Spirit of Christ, one and indivisible, the very 'fulness of Him that filleth all in all,' guides the counsels of his Church, as the inherent Spirit of heavenly Wisdom; and the acts of individuals, as the Giver of all Grace. This truth is asserted in a very particular way by St Paul to the Corinthians; where, after shewing that the manifold Spirit of Christ worketh variously in the various members of his body, he adds, that the body for all that is one, and that body is Christ. 'For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ.' The Apostle then enlarges upon this important truth, and establishes

1 Cor. xii. 12.

¹ Σῶμα ἑαντοῦ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καλεῖ ὁ Χριστός. Suidas.

his meaning too clearly for misconception, by comparing in detail the various functions of the living members of Christ's body, with the particular offices of our bodily limbs, in relation to the centre of unity the head; and these living members he says in the aggregate form the body of Christ: 'Ye are the body of Christ, and members' ¹ *ἐκ* 1 Cor. xii. 27. *μέρους*, singly and individually.' The Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians again, are full of the same way of speaking. Thus the Spirit of Christ was variously conferred on Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, and the other ministerial grades, 'for the edifying the body of Christ, until,' as one collective catholic body, *οἱ πάντες*, 'we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' And, that there might be no doubt about his meaning, the apostle is careful to add, that Christ and his Church form one heavenly body, as truly one through the Spirit, as head and limbs form one body, through that *ἐντελεχεία* or spirit of animal life that pervades the whole. 'That we henceforth...may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.' To the same purport are the words of

The body
of Christ.

Eph. iv. 13.

Eph. iv. 15,
16.

¹ The Syriac translator renders the words, *ܠܥܠܡܐ* 'in locis vestris.'

Christ
the Head.

the Apostle to the Colossians. His subject leads him to assert a Christian freedom from the bondage of the Jewish ritual: 'Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ¹;' i.e. the Mosaic ritual was as a shadow, forecast of the Christian Church, which is the body of Christ; and St Paul then repeats the idea in a parallel passage, wherein the intimate union of the body, and its various members, with the head is exhibited: 'Let no man beguile you of your reward,...And not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.' These words are a close parallel of the preceding, and they both find a common centre in the truth, that the Church is the body of Christ, as Christ the Saviour is the Head and quickening Spirit, and essential *vis vitæ* of the Church.

Col. ii. 18.

Ibid. 19.

It is in no figurative sense, therefore, that the Apostle in the same epistle declares Christ to be 'the head of the body the Church;' or that his own afflictions in preaching the Gospel of Christ were 'for His body's sake, which is the Church.' And in this point of view, there is the deepest significance in the words of our Liturgy, when the congregation of faithful souls prays, that, by a true communion with the heavenly Head of the Church,

Col. i. 18.

Col. i. 24.

¹ τὸ δὲ σῶμα Χριστοῦ. The body is Christ. ܬܝܢܐ ܕܚܝܣܬܐ
Syriac evidently read Χριστός, 'The ܚܝܣܬܐ.

‘our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most Precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us.’ Christ the Head.

As the spirit, then, is to the body of Man, so is Christ the very well-spring of life to his body the Church; pervading the whole substance as the Divine Word, and quickening each separate member with such measures of grace, as are adapted to its being. So, in the human body, each part is fitted for its peculiar functions by its own characteristic attributes; the animated being of the entire man is one, the phases of animation are various in the various members. So again, the bended knee, and uplifted hands; the glowing heart, and intent eye; the reflective brain, and disciplined tongue; are all of them separate manifestations of the devotional spirit of prayer, that brings man into close communion with God; the Spirit is one, the outward evidence of its existence may be manifold. And full of awe is the idea, that Christ is the life of the Church; that each living member is quickened by Him, each after his measure for receiving the good Gift; that He is the Spirit of his Body, and that individual souls are filled with His presence, each one after its capacity for assimilating the Spirit of Holiness! Of the Son alone it is true that ‘the Father giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him;’ but He shines also into the hearts of his servants; and they possessing the treasure in earthen vessels, possess it only in part; though we have the sure warrant of Scripture that with respect

John iii. 34.
2 Cor. iv. 6.

The Spouse
of Christ.

1 Cor. xiii. 10.

Phil. iii. 21.

to this and every other manifestation of the Spirit, 'when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away;' for Christ shall at length 'change our vile body, that it may be like unto his glorious body.'

Eph. v. 30.

Eph. v. 23.

The most usual figure, likewise, whereby this reality is expressed in Scripture leads us back to the same fact, that the Church is the Body of Christ, 'of His flesh, and of His bones.' For in the figurative language of Scripture the Church is the Spouse of Christ. Now those who by matrimony are made one, are as one flesh. The first pair, Adam and Eve, were relatively to each other, one body, the woman having been formed out of man, bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh. And that individual relation that existed between our first parents, is symbolized in the adunation by marriage of their descendants. As therefore the husband is head of the wife by origination, so is Christ 'head of the Church;' and He is 'saviour of the body,' as in the earliest ages the believing husband perpetually was known as a saviour to the unbelieving wife. Now this is not a figure of that which is itself a figurative expression, but of a fact. The mystical union of husband and wife symbolizes the homogeneity of nature and oneness of bodily constitution and continuous identity, so to speak, that subsisted between our first parents. The mystical union that exists between Christ and his Church, by symbolizing the unity of his human nature, with our own nature, marks the fact, that as members of that Church we are 'of his flesh and of his bones.' The

figurative language of Scripture, therefore, is wholly expressive of that highest aspect in which the Church is privileged to regard the relation in which she stands to her Lord and Saviour, as her head; partaking of her own human nature, even as she is admitted to a spiritual union with the Divine. In his lower or fleshly nature Christ is connatural with his Church, in her higher and spiritual existence, the Church is one with the Father and the Son through the Spirit. ‘As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us!’

The Spouse
of Christ.

John xvii. 11,
21, 22.

¹ St Augustine in many places sets forth the Scriptural truth that the Church is the body of Christ, and that she has an individual existence in him, who as her head is the very life. He repeats the idea again and again, because of its deep importance, and excuses himself at times to his hearers for the repetition. e. g. ‘Commendamus autem sæpius, nec nos piget iterare quod vobis utile est retinere, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum plerumque loqui ex se, id est, ex persona corporis sui, quod sumus nos et ecclesia ejus; sed ita quasi ex unius hominis ore sonare verba, ut intelligamus caput et corpus in unitate integritatis consistere, nec separari ab invicem; tamquam conjugium illud, de quo dictum est, Erunt duo in carne una.’ Aug. *Enarr. in Ps.* xl. ‘Christus autem, ut sæpe commemoravimus caritatem vestram, et caput et corpus est, nec nos a Christo alienos dicere debemus, cujus membra sumus, nec nos quasi alterum computare; quia erunt duo in carne una.’ *in Ps.* liv. 1. ‘Et quoniam totus Christus caput est et corpus, quod bene vos nosse non dubito,

caput est ipse Salvator noster..... corpus autem ejus est ecclesia; non ista, aut illa, sed toto orbe diffusa; nec ea quæ nunc est in hominibus qui præsentem vitam agunt, sed ad eam pertinentibus etiam his, qui fuerint ante nos, et his, qui futuri sunt post nos usque in finem sæculi. Tota enim Ecclesia constans ex omnibus fidelibus, quia fideles omnes membra sunt Christi, habet illud caput positum in cælis, quod gubernat corpus suum; etsi separatum est visione, sed annectitur caritate.Noluit loqui separatim, quia noluit esse separatus, dicens, “Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem sæculi.” Si nobiscum est, loquitur in nobis, loquitur de nobis, loquitur per nos; quia et nos loquimur in illo; et ideo verum loquimur quia in illo loquimur. Nam quando in nobis et ex nobis loqui voluerimus, in mendacio remanebimus.’ *in Ps.* lvi. 1. ‘Multa ergo membra ejus sub uno capite, ipso Salvatore nostro, caritatis et pacis vinculo colligata, sicut nosse dignamini quoniam sæpissime audistis, unus homo sunt, et ipsorum ut unius hominis vox plerumque in

The
Church
predesti-
nate.

Ps. ii. 7.

Since the Church is the body of Christ, her existence in the All-wise Counsels of God dates from all eternity by an everlasting decree. 'This day have I begotten thee,' was decreed with respect to the Son before the worlds or time were created; the Church, 'which is his body,' was also fore-ordained from everlasting. It were a manifest irreverence to suppose, that God should have created man upon earth, with Paradise for his destined abode, and that Satan should have had power to reverse that beneficent purpose, and mar the counsels of the Almighty; rendering it necessary that the salvation of mankind through Christ should afterwards be devised and brought in. But 'known unto God are all his works from the beginning;' Christ is 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' that is, from all eternity; the benefit of that holy sacrifice therefore was decreed in the eternal counsels; and the recipients of that benefit, though unknown to us otherwise, than through the practical obedience of the Gospel, were known numerically to God before the foundation of the world.

Acts xv. 18.

Rev. xiii. 8.

It is impossible that any should be true members of Christ without being in some degree conformed to his image, for they are called in Him

Psalmis auditur, et sic doceat unus tamquam omnes, quia omnes in uno unus sunt.' in *Ps.* lxviii. 1. Again, in his commentary upon the first Epistle of St John, having introduced the text of Isaiah lxi. 10, he says, 'Unus videtur loqui, et sponsum

se fecit, et sponsam se fecit; quia non duo sed una caro; quia Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis. Illi carni adjungitur Ecclesia et fit Christus totus, caput et corpus.' in 1 *Joh.* i. *Tract.* i. 2.

‘according to the purpose of God;’ this being ‘His will,’ and therefore ‘His eternal purpose,’ ‘even our sanctification.’ After this manner St Paul exhibits the golden chain of salvation. ‘We know that all things work together for good, to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called : and whom he called, them he also justified : and whom he justified, them he also glorified.’ There are none glorified who are not previously justified through faith in that blood that cleanseth from all sin ; none are justified but those that are called to God in Christ ; none are called according to God’s *sanctifying* purpose, who are not members of that body, the spiritual Church, that from all eternity was predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son ; and the Church has not been predestined to glory, without a full foreknowledge in the wisdom of God, of each separate member that should enter into its constitution. With the divine decrees we can have nothing further to do. We are placed in a state of salvation, in that body whose path of holiness has been decreed from everlasting. Sufficient have we to think of, if, in that strait and narrow path, we have grace given to us, as unworthy members of Christ’s body, to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling.

In proportion as his Church upon earth obtains mercy and grace so to walk, in the same proportion

The
Church
predesti-
nate.

Rom. viii.
28—30.

The
Church
militant.

Col. ii. 17.

is the glory of her Lord reflected in her; and it is of the collective graces of the individual members of which such a Church is composed that St Paul says, 'we all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.'

Such then is the ideality of the Church of Christ, and the account of her eternally decreed heavenly relations, that we find sketched forth in the Word of God. The next point that demands our attention is her earthly constitution, and the living features that serve to identify her, wherever planted upon earth.

II. The Church of Christ, as viewed in relation to the eternal counsels of God, on the one hand, and the issue of its future triumphant state on the other, consists in its essence¹ of only true-hearted and faithful servants of God, real members of Christ's body, and truly one with him as soul and body make one man. To God the existence of this Church and its numerical constitution has been foreknown from all eternity. 'In thy book were all my members written, when as yet there was none of them.' But the time for the manifestation of the sons of God is not yet. For the present the Church is militant on earth; it is the net cast into the sea that contains within its meshes good fish and bad; that which is profitable, as well as worth-

Ps. cxxxix.
16.

¹ In the forcible words of Augustine, 'Propter malam pollutamque conscientiam damnati a Christo, jam in corpore Christi non sunt,

quod est ecclesia; quoniam non potest Christus habere damnata membra.' *Contr. Cresc. Don.* II. 21.

less refuse. It is the vessel spreading to the four corners of the earth, that contains both the clean and the unclean in its capacious bosom. It is the ripening harvest field, that teems with the promise of a plenteous return of good and serviceable grain, but concealing beneath the true crop a tangled growth of weeds. Evil however is accidental, the body is still of Christ. And since all are included in this body who in whatever age of the world have been justified through a principle of faith in God, and obedience to his commands, any supposition, either that the foundation of the Church of believers was first laid, or that the faith that justifies, was brought in only under the Gospel, would be wholly contrary to the statements of Scripture. We may not confine the existence of the Church within narrower limits, than the whole work of redemption from the beginning of the world. The Church is coextensive with the redeemed. In a general but true sense, all whom God admits into covenant with him, and who hold the promise of a life of eternal happiness hereafter, are an *ἐκκλησία* or an assembly of faithful men. Both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man; and ‘they are not to be heard, which feign that the Old Fathers did look only for transitory promises¹.’ If there-

The
Church
militant.

Col. ii. 17.

Art. VII.

¹ ‘This visible Church is but one, continued from the first beginning of the world to the last end. Which company being divided into

two moieties; the one before, the other since the coming of Christ, that part which since the coming of Christ, partly hath embraced, and

The Church militant.	fore under the Christian dispensation we are justified by faith only, on account of the merits of Christ, those merits have a retrospective as well as a prospective character; and faith has been the principle, whereby alone men have been justified from the beginning, by virtue of the blood of Christ that cleanseth from all sin, as of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Thus the prophet assured the Jewish Church, that 'the just shall live by faith;' and the great forefather of God's chosen people 'believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness.' At an earlier date again Noah, 'a preacher of righteousness,' through the spirit of Christ, was himself 'heir of the righteousness which is by faith.' And in the very first infancy of the human race Abel offered a sacrifice that was significant of salvation by the blood of Christ; 'by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts.' In every age of the world therefore, there has been an assembly of faithful men, whatever its numerical development, possessing more or less of the light of God's truth, and sealed to everlasting life in the measure of grace vouchsafed to them. The effectiveness of the Church indeed in all ages of the world has not been the same. In the Church of the Patriarchs the worship of God was observed as a more domestic act, each head of a family ministering to his tribe and dependents in things pertaining to God. In the Jewish Church, the Patri-
Art. XI.	
Hab. ii. 4.	
Gen. xv. 6.	
Compare 2 Pet. ii. 5, 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, Heb. xi. 7.	
Heb. xi. 4.	

partly shall hereafter embrace the Christian religion, we term as by a more proper name the Church of Christ.' Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* III. 1.

archal simplicity was expanded to a polity, and the children of Israel as a holy nation, the peculiar people of the Lord, prefigured the Church of Christ that should be coextensive with the ends of the earth. The present Church again, is only a shadow and a type of the true existence of one and all of these various religious systems, the final cause of their constitution, the Church triumphant in heaven. In each phase however of its existence, the Church of faithful men has varied to suit the varying character of man's social state, harmonising with the degree of light conveyed. Thus the Mosaic institutions were wholly inapplicable to the earlier ages of the world, and the Law, 'added because of transgressions,' was not needed in an age, when the will of God was made known by continued and immediate revelation; and when the traditions of Paradise were not wholly lost through distance. If also before the day of Christ, God was pleased to require less of those to whom less had been given, his demands are now of a far higher character, when himself grants the strength to perform them. Christ died and ascended up on high, that the will of man might be reclaimed from evil by his own free spirit; that a new Law might be proclaimed, the working principle of which is love and good will, the spirit of it perfect freedom; and the Gospel differs from every other Law in this very particular. It is a law of liberty because it begins from the very foundation of all, by altering the corrupt will, by putting it into the heart of man to love that which God doth command, and to desire

Patriarchal
and
Jewish.

The
Church

that which he doth promise; enabling him also by spontaneous action, through the overruling grace of Christ, to run the way of God's commandments.

That truth then, which the holy men of old could only behold by faith¹, and beholding rejoice, is now in the fulness of time openly proclaimed; and the full light, that is vouchsafed under the Gospel, is declaratory of principles that are far more spiritual in their character than any were of old; the motives also of obedience are higher, and God's assistance that he vouchsafes all powerful, engaging to his own free service the first springs of human action in the will. The Church of the redeemed therefore is one from the beginning, as it will hereafter be one in triumph and glory; but the demands of God upon man have varied proportionately to the degree of light vouchsafed to him;

Luke xii. 49. 'Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall

¹ The certainty that the Jews were already under covenant with God, and therefore within the definition of a Church, serves perhaps to explain one very remarkable expression in the New Testament; where the apostle, writing to the Romans, iii. 30, states pointedly that by virtue of the ancient covenant, God is the God of the Jews; but he adds, that he is now the God of the Gentiles also. The Jew, becoming a disciple of Christ, still continued under covenant with God, while the Gentile was thereby first affoederated. The different idea is marked by a verbal distinction, the delicacy of which has been very generally overlooked. To Jew and Gentile alike, 'God is one,' and the

faith that justifies is one; but faith was to the Jew an already existent principle, though greatly modified as having Christ for its new object, and therefore the Jewish convert is justified *ἐκ πίστεως*, as the just was long before declared to live *ἐκ πίστεως*. But faith to the Gentile was a wholly new and unknown principle; and through the gate of faith alone, he could enter into covenant with God. With respect to the Gentile therefore the term is slightly changed, and the uncircumcision is said to be justified *διὰ τῆς πίστεως* through faith. Compare Gladstone, *Church Princ.* v. 51, and Rothe, *Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche*, i. § 42, as quoted by him.

much be required.' The constitution also of the Church has obtained an expansive character, harmonising entirely with the social advancement of man. Built up
on Faith.

Now this view of the primæval antiquity of the Church, embracing all of every age in whom faith has been a living principle, helps to explain the text, ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, and which it may not be out of place to notice. Faith in God led the Israelites of old to have a firm hope in Christ; so in the desert they are said to have drunk of the 'Spiritual Rock' that followed them, which Rock is Christ. Faith in God led St Peter to witness the good confession, 'Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God,' and upon that Rock, Christ declared that his Church was built. The full assurance of faith, in either case, was the Rock of Salvation, and the true spiritual Israel has in every age slaked its thirst in the streams welling forth from it. If therefore ¹that spiritual Rock was the foundation of God's Church of old, the analogy of faith is hardly observed in that interpretation of the Saviour's words, which would make St Peter the Rock upon which the Church should then first be built. The grammatical form οἰκοδομήσω would,

¹ Compare the interpretation of Augustin, *de Trin.* ii. 28. *Vind. Cath.* i. 87. According to this Father, the Rock was the 'pillar and ground' of faith. 'In solido fidei fundamento stantes, quod est Petra.' Cyril of Alexandria says the same. *Vind. Cath.* ii. 413. 'And the Rock, from the cleft of which Moses beheld some portion of the glory of

the Lord, was the Church Catholic.' c. 30. So also Basil. Ἴδοὺ τόπος, φησί, παρ' ἐμοί, καὶ στῆθι ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας· τί ἄλλο λέγων τὸν τόπον, ἢ τὴν ἐν Πνεύματι θεωρίαν, ἐν ᾗ γενόμενος, ἐδύνατο ἰδεῖν γνωστῶς ἐμφανιζόμενον αὐτῷ τὸν Θεὸν ὁ Μωϋσῆς; οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος ὁ τῆς ἀληθινῆς λατρείας ἴδιος. *De Sp. S.* LXII. *Vind. Cath.* i. 422.

On this
Rock.

Luke xxiii.
46.

Heb. x. 7.

Rom. iii. 30.

it is true, appear to mark a future event, as though the Church as yet were non-existent; but the vernacular Syriac, in which our Saviour spoke, exhibits no such distinctive inflexion; precisely the same form being used in that language for the future as for the present tense. Neither will Greek analogy compel us to assign a true future sense and no other to *οικοδομήσω*. It can be shewn, that, in the language of the Greek Testament, a present or an indefinite past idea is expressed by the future verb; and, where the Deity is the subject, the shade of meaning conveyed by such an enallage denotes the sure accomplishment of predetermined counsel. So, for instance, when our Lord breathed forth his spirit, it was with the words, ‘Father, into thy hands I commend (*παραθήσομαι*) my spirit.’ The verb is formally future, the idea is logically present; but the future verb suggests at the same time the idea of accomplished definite purpose, ‘Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.’ Again, in the Epistle to the Romans it is said, ‘It is one God, which (*δικαιώσει*) shall justify the circumcision by faith,’ &c. Justification is generally treated of in the passage, and the logical idea of time is indefinite, the action habitual; but the verb thrown formally into the future, marks the sure fulfilment of God’s eternal purpose. Now if these two instances be applied to elucidate the meaning of our Lord’s words to St Peter, a kindred analogy will justify the belief, that a future sense need not be affixed of necessity to *οικοδομήσω*; but that the logical idea being wholly indefinite, the future

form serves to indicate the sure and progressive accomplishment of God's will, by the Divine Word, from the beginning. It is satisfactory also to observe, that a similar usage of the future form is not unknown in classical Greek. τὸν ὀρθῶς βιω- On this
Rock.
σόμενον in the Gorgias implies a fixed purpose, and not a future act; 'he that purposeth to live aright.' And the words of Xenophon, εἴ γε πεινήσουσι καὶ διψήσουσι, are correctly rendered, 'if to hunger and thirst be their lot;' the future verb not of necessity denoting futurity, but marking rather the antecedent operation of an overruling destiny. Matt. Gr. Gr.

According to this view, the words of our Lord to St Peter will mean, that in accordance with the eternal purposes of the Father, the Church, whether of the Patriarchs, or Prophets, or Apostles, is built upon the faith of Christ. The fathers interpret the words as often in this way as in any other. The same father not unfrequently renders the words variously in various places. In fact, the independent significations applied to the Rock on which the Church is built, is quite sufficient to convince us, that the Primitive Church either possessed no certain traditional clue to the one meaning of our Lord's words, or that it had been lost again in the earliest times. St Augustine having, in one of his earlier treatises, explained 'this Rock' of St Peter personally, afterwards corrected himself in his *Retractations*; but still left the reader to the guidance of his own judgment. 'In which book (against the epistle of Donatus), I said of the Apostle Peter, that the

Notes
of the
Church.

Church was founded upon him as upon a rock... But I am aware that afterwards I have frequently given such an explanation to this text, as would imply that the Church is built upon Him, whom St Peter confessed, saying, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God"... "But that Rock was Christ;" and for confessing Him, as the whole Church confesseth, Simon was called Peter. But the reader may adopt whichever of these two interpretations his judgment best allows¹.

It is with the later and more spiritual portion of the Church of God, namely, the Church of Christ, that the Creed is occupied. And this Church is commended to our faith as One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolical Body.

See Hooker,
p. 478.

The Church of Christ, that other and holier moiety of the Church of God, was no sooner constituted, and armed with divine authority by the gift of the Holy Ghost, than certain notes and marks were supplied, which, to the end of time, should be its invariably distinctive and characteristic features. For the immediate result of St Peter's discourse on the day of Pentecost was, that about three thousand souls of believers were added to the Church by baptism; and having been so baptized, 'They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of

Acts ii. 42.

¹ 'In quo dixi in quodam loco de Apostolo Petro, quod in illo tamquam in petra fundata sit Ecclesia;Sed scio me postea sæpissime sic exposuisse quod a Domino dictum est,.....ut super hunc intelligeretur quem confessus est Petrus

dicens, Tu es Christus Filius Dei Vivi.....Petra autem erat Christus, quem confessus Simon, sicut eum tota Ecclesia confitetur, dictus est Petrus. Harum autem duarum sententiarum, quæ sit probabilior, eligat lector.' Aug. *Retract.* i. 21.

bread, and in prayers.' There was a common faith, as received from the Apostles. Common sacraments; Baptism, whereby believers became members of Christ, and one through Christ with God; and the heavenly Communion of the Bread of Life. There was the devotional spirit also, which bound them all together in one holy brotherhood, as one body in Christ. Such were the distinctive notes of the Church supplied by the Holy Spirit, in the very first day of its formation. It was a visible body, of many members, but animated with one spirit; it had the life-giving sacraments, dispensed by an order of men duly authorised to act in the name of God; in the absence also of any written account of our Lord's history, and of the gracious words that proceeded from his mouth, it had 'the doctrine of the Apostles,' containing the *credenda* of religion, such as were since sketched out to us in the Creeds, and more fully developed in the Gospels. Further, in the application of these means of grace, the living notes of the Church, 'they continued stedfastly,' ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες; a significant demonstration, that it is not sufficient to have the Word of God and his Sacraments, and the unspeakable comfort of a duly commissioned ministry; but that there must be also the living Spirit to animate the ordinance, the inner man created anew in Christ Jesus, as well as outward, bodily membership. Without this inwardly-renewed spirit, and stedfast continuance in grace, it is impossible that we should be true members of Christ's body, however surely we may be

Notes
of the
Church.

incorporated into the visible Church by his sacrament of Baptism, and continue in our Communion with it, through an unwavering observance of the externals of church-membership.

It is in strict accordance with these earliest notes of the Church, that the Creeds predicate of it, that it is One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church; they are, in fact, the distinct notes of essential attributes of the Church; a triple specification is given; but all three concur in the idea of unity. In its first origin on the day of Pentecost the Church of Christ was one, for it continued in the doctrine and fellowship of the Apostles, who were in word and in spirit so wholly one; and for the same reason it was Apostolical. It was holy as being instinct with sacramental life, forming one body with Christ through the Spirit, and holding close communion with the Holy One. It was Catholic as being the first germ of the Churches throughout the world, and no longer limited to one race; for all nations and languages were virtually represented in the three thousand souls that were converted to Christ, and were bound together, as one Holy, Apostolical Body, at that Pentecostal meeting.

The unity of the Church therefore respects the Spirit, that is her life and substantial existence; the faith, that from the beginning she has confessed; the sacramental bond, that cements the whole body together into one visible and living whole; and the administrative constitution, whereby the form of government given to her by the Apo-

stles acting under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, has continued as the key-stone of her polity ever since. In the Church 'we have access by one Spirit unto the Father;' 'there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism.' And since there can be no security that unity in these particulars should be preserved, or that the inward spirit should long continue to be one, where the outward form is diverse, therefore there is one body also, 'a living voice of perpetual witnesses;' the visible unity of one self-consistent system of ecclesiastical regimen, as the pledge of the inward grace of unity in sacramental faith.

Notes
of the
Church.

Eph. ii. 18.

Eph. iv. 4.

Let us proceed to consider how these several particulars apply to the Church of all ages.

First then when the Church is declared to be One, we must understand this to be the great characteristic note of the Church, which embraces the other three particulars of Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity, as genus comprehends species. For it is one as reconciled and made one with Christ in God, who alone is Holy. The holiness which she receives as the very being of the Holy Ghost, and which pervades all her members, each after its capacity for receiving the good gift, is one, as the eternal principle of Truth, and Love, and heavenly Wisdom, is one. Her 'life is hid with Christ in God.' Christ is her life; and that Spirit of Holiness whereby the Son is one with the Father, unites the Church also of living souls through the Incarnate Son with the Father.

Col. iii. 3.

Again, the Church is One by reason of its Ca-

One and
Catholic.

tholicity. For, to be Catholic, is to be universal, to be universal, is to have many parts indeed, but each several part concentrically arranged around one common nucleus. By reason therefore of that focal unity, the Church throughout the whole world is one undivided whole. Its members indeed may speak in languages mutually unknown to each other; in subordinate matters they may claim for themselves full Christian liberty; and exercise it in the ordering of ceremonies, and liturgical usages, each national Church for its own self, and according to its own peculiar need; but such variations from the common type as these, arising from the accidents of climate, or of race, or even of political constitution, need not interfere with the substantial Catholic integrity of each. The broad features of Catholicity are exhibited in Scripture with no cramped or limited application. 'Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God.' 'He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.' Only, in both cases, sacramental union with Christ by baptism must be presupposed; faith without baptism is a nullity; 'he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,' is the Christian's charter; and none is born of God, but he that shews forth his faith agreeably to this normal qualification. Again, 'As many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ,' and no man 'hath the Son,' but he who, sacramentally, is buried with his Lord by 'baptism unto death,' and dies from thenceforth to sin, and lives a new life by faith in Christ

1 John v. 1.

1 John v. 12.

Mark xvi. 16.

Gal. iii. 27.

Jesus. The Church Catholic, therefore, is one by reason of the broad doctrinal foundation on which it is built, faith in the Son of God, in all that he taught, in all that he suffered for us, in all that he gives, in all that He was, and is, and ever will be, to the souls of men. Hence, whatever sacraments Christ has ordained in his Church lie at the very foundation of the faith. There is no life through the Son, where these are despised or neglected. ‘Except a man be born of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.’ ‘Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.’ The two life-giving Sacraments are the true keys of heaven interpretative of the inward spiritual meaning of Scripture, in its most vital aspect; declaratory of the Apostles’ doctrine by the subsidiary instruction of the Creeds; dispensed also by a ministry deriving their authority to consecrate the holy symbols, by an orderly and unbroken succession from the Apostles. The Sacraments are outward and visible signs of the true Church of Christ; and no Church possesses them in their integrity, without being able to shew a clear title in every other respect to the denomination of the one, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. And how shall a Church possessing these expressions of Christ’s quickening grace be any thing else than One with the Universal Church of every clime and every age? feeding upon the self-same holy mysteries in her heart of hearts; mysteries that are consecrated to her use by the same words of love,

One and
Catholic.

John iii. 5.

John vi. 53.

One and
Catholic.

by means of a similarly-constituted ministry; and exhibiting, whether for the instruction of her catechumens, or for the comfort, and faith, and love of her more advanced sons, those Creeds, that are the very nucleus of light, the doctrine of the Apostles; that, next to the Sacraments, constitute the broad distinctive mark, that the teaching of each separate Church is Catholic, and that each is one in heart, and one in doctrine with the Church of all ages. The Sacraments are a bond of unity, and serve to create and preserve a closely vital communion between man and God; while they establish a firm principle of brotherly love and oneness of spirit between man and man. They are declaratory to each individual of his high privilege that he is 'born of God;' that he is a child of God, by virtue of his union through the Spirit with the Eternal Son; and that this union is preserved to him by constantly recurring acts of a most intimate communion, wherein it is vouchsafed to his soul to be nourished and fed with the Spirit of life, in the mystical representation of his Lord's Body and Blood. 'He that is joined unto the Lord,' in this way, 'is one Spirit;' an integral portion of his body the Church, the unity of which is neither severed by time, nor interrupted by distance.

1 Cor. vi. 17.

The term 'Catholic,' therefore, which was adopted originally in the Oriental and Southern Creeds, and, subsequently, incorporated¹ in the Western

¹ See the Creed of the Church that of the Alexandrian Church, of Jerusalem, *Vind. Cath.* i. 538; *ibid.* p. 545; the Creed found in

formularies of faith, involves the unity of the Church in all fundamental points; and no Church can depart from that unity, without in the same degree forfeiting its title to Catholicity.

One and
Aposto-
lical.

So also the Church is one, because it is Apostolical. 'As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you,' were the words, whereby the 'Apostle and High Priest of our profession' delegated his own authority over the Church visible to his immediate friends and followers, who had continued with him in his temptations. They were, 'in Christ's stead,' as the governing body of the Church; and whatever form of government they established, was, by anticipation, ratified by the Divine Head of the Church, in the sure words of gracious promise, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' When, therefore, their commission was given to go into all the world and to preach the Gospel to every creature, with a scope as wide as our Lord's own mission, 'that the world through him might be saved;' and when the vastness of the work rendered it impossible, that they should personally fulfil that command, or be present with the Church of all ages; it followed that, acting in the name and in the stead of Christ, they should extend to others the same degree of authority, that they had themselves received. They ordained men duly qualified for the high office of rulers and teachers in the Church of

John xx. 21.

Heb. iii. 1.

Luke xxii. 28.

Matt. xxviii.
20.

John iii. 17.

the *Apostolical Constitutions*, *ibid.* p. 537; and the Creed of Constantinople, *ibid.* p. 553. On the other hand, Cyprian first exhibits the Wes-

tern type, expressing faith 'in Sanctam Ecclesiam' *ibid.* 531, which is followed also by Ruffinus, *ibid.* 579.

Aposto-
lical.

Christ, to transmit the pure light of the Gospel to the Churches successively established; to see that all things pertaining to the service of God were done decently and in order; and to take care that the Sacraments of Christ were administered in all 'the beauty of holiness.' An order of men was thus constituted, with authority from Christ, to be the pillars of the Church visible; who were apostolical, as receiving their ordination immediately from the hands of the Apostles; and one, as uniformly teaching the same body of saving doctrine. And they were empowered to ordain others, in like manner, as they had themselves been consecrated to the service of God, with authority to deliver in their turn to a successional hierarchy, the same Creed, that is, the one apostolical interpretation of the Word of Life; the same life-giving and life-sustaining Sacraments; and the same Christian liberty of action also; whereby, reserving to the Word its apostolical interpretation, and to the Sacraments their divine function of forming Christ within the soul, the Church of Christ has ever had the fullest freedom to rule all matters of minor detail, according to the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Wherever the Spirit is one, the analogy of faith is preserved; and whatever those outward forms may be, in their soul and spirit, they are one, throughout the one indefectible and Apostolical Church of Christ. A Church thus conducted for nearly two thousand years, and exhibiting the same form of organic constitution that the hands of the blessed Apostles had modelled in its early origin, may well claim for

itself the august title of Apostolical. In this respect, again, the unity of the Church of Christ as yet has never been dissolved. By God's grace she is still the 'city upon an hill;' and, in her divine constitution, at least, 'at unity with herself,' Holy, Catholic, and Apostolical.

Therefore
visible.

As a corollary to the two last heads, that the Church is one by reason of her Catholicity and Apostolicity, it may be added, that she is also a visible body; comprising all who have been sacramentally enrolled among her members, and have openly adopted the faith of Christ in the sight of men and angels; she is visible also, as deriving her authority through the laying on of Apostolic hands, from Christ her heavenly head. Her Sacraments, and her succession of duly-ordained priests, to the end of time, will be her outward and visible credentials, that she stands forth in Christ's name, and that they who minister at her altars are called of God outwardly and visibly, as was Aaron.

The Church of England, in drawing up her XIXth Article, 'Of the Church,' confines her definition to the notes of the visible Church; but these notes involve the three elements of unity already described. 'The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.' Now these notes can only be satisfied in a body that is Holy, Apostolical, and Catholic. It must be holy, from the very first term in the defi-

The visible
Church.

nition, that it is a congregation of faithful men ; for however the evil may be mixed up with it for the present in its outward constitution, it contains a nucleus within, as true members of that Holy Body, that from all eternity was foreordained to be conformed to the image of Christ ; and as containing this inward germ of the heavenly, the visible Church is essentially a Holy Church. Again, it must be Apostolical, as well as Holy ; because in it ‘the pure Word of God is preached.’ Unless the Church had derived her authority from the Apostles by an unbroken succession, it could not have been known for certain, that the Bible of Her Faith is the Word of God, such as the Apostles received and fed upon in their hearts, and preached throughout the world. One main function of the Church visible has been from the beginning, to continue as ‘the keeper and witness of Holy Writ.’ Her claim, whereby she has exercised that office throughout the world, has still been, that she is Apostolical ; this is, and ever was, her prescriptive right to the prejudice and estopping of heresy. Her Apostolical unity assures us, that the Word, and nothing but the Word, is preached by her. And as she possesses the Word of God in its integrity, so she teaches it also in its purity ; and if truths of Scripture, that appear to us to be most plain, had not descended to us by a perpetual tradition of Apostolical interpretation, the sure ground of faith would have been broken up ; the Church would have been found, in the course of ages, to be preaching ‘another Gospel.’ Subtle distinctions

would long since have explained away the most obvious truths of Scripture; suppression of particular aspects of evangelical doctrine would have given a false gloss to others; and perplexing misinterpretations of the Word of Life would have been indefinitely increased. But the Church is ‘the pillar and ground of truth;’ and reposing in the doctrine of the Church of the Apostles, we are certain that we hold the very truth. Practically it is found also, that those who differ most from the Church in externals, must still, unconsciously to themselves, receive the Word of Life at her hands, and the interpretation of it from her lips. The visible Church, therefore, is known to be the witness and keeper of the pure Word of God, for the very reason that she is Apostolical. For a similar reason, in duly ministering the Sacraments according to the ordinance of Christ, she must be no less sensibly Catholic. Christ committed his Sacraments to the faithful keeping of his Body, the Church, until his coming again; and only that body, which received those ordinances, can be duly authorized to administer them. It is not enough to satisfy the definition of a visible Church, that congregations of men, without the pale of the Church Catholic, should possess a semblance of the same Sacraments that were committed to the Church; for external disunion stamps them with a mark too plain to be mistaken; and in this essential particular they are not according to Christ’s ordinance. To be duly administered, the Sacraments must be dispensed by the Church Ca-

The visible
Church.

1 Tim. iii. 15.

Visible and Indefectible. catholic; in other words, Catholic Sacraments are a true note of the visible Church of Christ.

Anal. II. 1. The indefectibility of the Church also is in a certain sense dependent upon its visibility. Bishop Butler observes with his usual perspicuity, 'Had Moses and the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles, only taught, and by miracles proved, religion to their contemporaries, the benefits of their instructions would have reached but to a small part of mankind. Christianity must have been in a great degree sunk and forgot in a very few ages. To prevent this appears to have been one reason why a visible Church was instituted; to be like a city upon a hill, a standing memorial to the world, of the duty which we owe our Maker; to call men continually, both by example and instruction, to attend to it, and by the form of religion ever before their eyes, remind them of the reality; to be the repository of the Oracles of God; to hold up the light of revelation in aid to that of nature, and propagate it throughout all generations to the end of the world.'

The indefectibility of the Body attaches also in a certain external and visible sense to the members. For as regards membership of the visible Church, one very important truth should be borne in mind; that however the power of the keys may have been committed to the Apostle St Peter as the mouthpiece and representative of the apostolical body at large; and however the authority to bind and loose may have been continued to their

successors in the government of the Church, we have no scriptural reason for extending these functions beyond the enfranchisement of the spirit of man from the service of Satan, and consecrating it to the service of God in Baptism; and subsequently imposing and removing the spiritual censures and penalties of the Church, which have for their object the healthful edification of her members in holiness¹. But for the total ejection of any from the Church, for whatever crime, there is no authority whatever, short of the final judgment. Unsound members may be debarred for a time from all comfort of communion with the Church, but not cruelly lopped off from her body. He that disobeys her warning voice, and refuses to hear the Church, may be considered for a time, by virtue of her censures, 'as a heathen man and publican;' but he does not thereby relapse into a raw state of heathenism; he is still within the pale of the Church visible, though as a disgraced member; else were his sin wholly irremissible.

External
Inde-
fectibility.

Hence the most wilful defection from the faith is instanced by the Apostle, not as ἀπόπτωσις, a total falling away, although it has been so ren-

¹ This view of the Power of the Keys would seem to have been taken by Lactantius, where he defines the characteristic feature of the true Church of Christ, in opposition to heretical assemblies: 'Quia singuli quique cœtus hæreticorum se potissimum Christianos, et suam esse Catholicam Ecclesiam putant; sciendum est, illam esse veram, in qua est religio, confessio, et pœnitentia,

quæ peccata et vulnera, quibus est subjecta imbecillitas carnis, salubriter curat.' *Religio* being the vow made in Baptism wherein this mystical Power is first applied, *confessio et pœnitentia* denoting the subordinate exercise of the same power, whereby the Church absolved those that had fallen beneath her censure, after a sincere confession and penitential discipline.

External
Inde-
fectibility.

Heb. vi. 6.

1 Cor. v. 5.

Ad Phil. vi.

dered in our translation, but as ¹παράπτωσις, a falling by the way; and it is impossible to renew them again, ἀνακαθίζειν, by means of baptismal penitence. Still, the adoption of sons is the vocation wherewith they are called; and may be realised eventually, however for the present they be delivered to Satan by a temporary estrangement from the body of Christ. They bear the mark of the Cross upon the brow, the mark of the beast cannot wholly obliterate it. ‘Nigh unto cursing,’ they may be, yet in no absolute sense as yet, wholly and irrecoverably reprobate. For Baptism is one, and cannot be repeated; and He who is born of water and the Spirit, is so born once for all. If, therefore, excommunication inflicted by the Church were tantamount to a total expulsion, there would remain indeed no more room for repentance; the birthright would be wholly forfeited, and could no more be recovered, however carefully it might be sought with the tears of a true sorrow. For these reasons, he that is once incorporated by Baptism into the Church, can never after be removed from it, on this side of the grave. The exhortation, then, of Polycarp, to the Philippian presbytery, that they should be, μὴ ἀποτόμοι ἐν κρίσει, expresses exactly the true relation of the Church to those that fall beneath her censure; severe she may be in her love for the souls of men and of God’s truth, but with no exterminating vengeance. ‘Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.’

¹ The Syriac marks this difference in rendering the words, καὶ πα-

ραπεσόντας, by ܩܝܪܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ
Qui rursus peccaverunt.

‘ Let both grow together until the harvest ; and in the time of harvest I will say unto the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them ; but gather the wheat into my barn.’ ‘ For apparent it is, that all men are of necessity either Christians or not Christians. If by external profession they be Christians, then are they of the visible Church of Christ ; and Christians by external profession they are all, whose mark of recognizance hath in it those things that we have mentioned ; yea, although they be impious idolaters, wicked heretics, persons excommunicable, yea, and cast out for notorious improbity¹.’

External
Inde-
fectibility.
Matt. xiii. 30.

According to this constitutional theory, not even the Church Catholic has power wholly and finally to remove any unsound or offending member ; she may withhold for a season the accidents of visible communion ; but she cannot cut off from the Body of Christ. Much less can any particular branch of the Church, arrogating to itself alone that title of Catholic that belongs to all, annihilate with its anathemas the Christian character and Christian privileges of its sister churches. For such in fact is the schismatical position in which the Church of Rome has placed itself with respect to the rest of the Christian world ; casting forth from the body of Christ the Churches of the East, and branding with the fearful title of a soul-destroying heresy the faith of the West. It is not in the corporate life of such a Church, but in the individuals of which it is composed, that we must

¹ Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.* III. 1.

Hope of
future
Union.

look for the Spirit of Christ; in vain shall we search in her public bearing, towards those that owe her no allegiance, for any living signs of the heavenly spirit that 'suffereth long and is kind; that vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up; that beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.' Neither is it the Church of Rome alone that, in her public acts, has shewn herself deficient in the blessed quality, the bond of all other graces, that never faileth. The very character of charity, that it abideth when every other more temporary and provisional gift has run its course, causes it to have a weaker hold, by reason of the gross material interests with which it must come into collision upon earth. Heaven is its eternal abode, therefore the darkness of this world for the present comprehendeth it not.

We are certain indeed, that this gentle and easily entreated spirit shall at length be universal; but the rising of that day must be heralded by such a thorough and searching spiritual reformation throughout the whole Body Catholic, as we can scarcely imagine possible upon earth. The Church of Rome will then enlarge her sympathies towards the whole flock for which Christ was content to die; she will be most truly Catholic also in her practice, rescinding whatsoever she has superadded to the primitive faith. The orthodoxy of the East will be a right faith, not only of the intellect, but of the whole soul and spirit; when its Churches shall emerge from the mists of darkness that have

crept around their path. And the Church of England will at length shew herself yet more apostolically simple, yet more single-hearted in her devotion to the cause of her Lord; realizing at length the beauty of holiness of her high ideal, the Primitive Church, for whose godly discipline she still sends forth her aspiration year by year. In this way, and in this way alone, by the abatement of error, every where and in every thing, and by a true appreciation of the good gift of Christian charity, can union be restored to the distracted fold of Christ, and the whole world be gathered together in him, from the rising up of the sun unto the going down thereof. At that day the words of the Primitive Church in her Creed will no longer smite the heart of believers as the accents of reproach for their disunion; and professing faith in one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolical Church of Christ, there will be no afterthought of variance or mistrust to embitter the blessedness of their confession; for Jerusalem which is the mother of us all shall once more be as the 'city that is at unity with herself.'

Hope of
future
Union.

Communa-
tion Service.

The Church then, as the body of Christ, is as truly one with the divine head, as the various members of the human body form one continuous whole with the temple of intellect and thought, the head. The Spirit of adoption is as the bond of vital union. But this high privilege pertains alone to those, to whom 'to live is Christ,' whose will is made more and more conformable to the will of God as revealed in the Gospel. 'If any man have not the

Rom. viii. 9.

Conclu-
sion.

Spirit of Christ,' the meek and devotional, the truthloving and easily intreated, the self-sacrificing and compassionate spirit of Christ, 'he is none of His.' He may belong outwardly to the visible Church of Christ, but the harvest is not yet reaped, the net is not yet drawn in to shore, and to God alone is known from everlasting the true body of Christ, of which each member in varying degree, is 'conformed to the image of his Son.'

And until her warfare is accomplished, the Church on earth must also be known to man. She must be a visible and tangible reality, a true object of the senses, as much as any portion of the material world; a 'city upon an hill that cannot be hid.' An intellectual or spiritual abstraction should soon be found to be as ephemeral as any single generation of man. The Church therefore comes forth from the world in all the high and holy dignity, that bespeaks her to be the work of the God of order; she shews herself as one continuous successional *body* of men, as truly and visibly deriving their corporate existence from the second Adam, as their human nature descends to them from the first. Visible and tangible Sacraments are the means of embodying men in this holy Society; the inward and spiritual grace also mystically exhibited as it is and divinely conveyed under those sacraments, in its results, is as perceptible to the moral sense, as either outward symbol or historical succession can be to the physical and intellectual. 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one for another.' Never since the first

origin of the Christian Church, has it existed apart from the holy and kindly affectioned Spirit of Christ. 'He that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit;' and that Spirit beareth witness, by infallible external proof, of all faithful recipients of Christ's sacraments, that they are the children of God.

Conclu-
sion.

Rom. viii. 16.

The Church also, the body of Christ, is truly One; animated by the One Holy Spirit of God; one in doctrine, faith, and origin with the Church of the Apostles; in unison also with the Church of every clime and every age, so far as she is conformed through the Spirit to the image of the Eternal Son. But where the crookedness of human policy has perverted, or the mists of human ignorance have sullied the heavenly glory of Christ's Church, and marred the unity that is her natural characteristic, the Church may be indeed no longer one, in an outward sense; but the children of God are of every people and language; and the interruption of external unity can never extinguish that which is the very principle and bond of oneness, the inward and spiritual presence of Christ with his own true followers. One foundation there is upon which the whole superstructure is built; 'Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'

1 Cor. iii. 11.

Words of comfort therefore are those that follow; for if the spirit is saddened at the thought of the broken unity of Christ's Church, it revives with the remembrance that there is still a true

The Com-
munion of
Saints.

A pledge
of unity.

Communion of Saints, a fellowship of every individual worshipper of Christ in spirit and in truth, with God's servants of all ages, and every place. No arrogant lust of power can dissolve, at least, this holy tie; no schismatical pride of intellect can overlay the sacred flame of kindred affection, that warms each Christian's heart towards all that acknowledge the name of the Lord Jesus, and, acknowledging it, are conformed more and more to the high ideal holiness enshrined within. This sure and certain belief that there exists for the present a Communion of Saints, is the earnest that in God's good time his Church shall be once more as 'a city that is at unity with herself;' for it is impossible for the Christian to lay that blessed result to heart, and not pray that Christ's kingdom may come, that his will may be done, as in heaven, so in earth; it is impossible, that the collective prayer of Christians throughout the world, for the rising of this day of blessed union and peace, should return again void into their own bosom. A belief therefore in the Communion of Saints is at the same time a sure ground of faith that at some time peace shall be restored to the Church; when the fold, however grievously harassed and vexed for the present, and scattered abroad, shall be collected together again in one; when the Church visible shall be once more a type of final unity in the Spirit, when the redeemed shall be wholly Christ's, as Christ is wholly God's.

It is observable however that the clause under

consideration¹ does not take its place with the most ancient Articles of the Creed. Nothing similar to it is found in the Eastern Creeds. Ruffinus omits it in the Creed of Aquileia. Bishop Pearson observes, that the earliest recognition of the words as a portion of the Creed is found in certain short homilies on the Apostles' Creed, formerly attributed to Augustine. The fourth of this series in assigning each separate Article of the Creed to a particular Apostle, attributes to St Matthew the words of this clause; and the three following homilies in the series adopt them as an undoubted portion of the Apostles' Creed. Critically therefore the words would carry with them no high degree of authority. In the early infancy of the Christian Church such words of comfort were needless, when their substance was a matter of daily fruition; when 'the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common.' Again, in ages of oppression, when the Church, all glorious as she was within, was exposed continually from without to persecution, the

A pledge
of unity.

Aug. De
Symb. iv.
Serm. ccl.

Acts iv. 32.

¹ Bishop Taylor treats this clause as a synonymous expression with the preceding: 'What is the Catholic Church? The Apostles' Creed defines it; it is *Communio Sanctorum*, "I believe the Holy Catholic Church," that is, the Communion of Saints, the conjunction of all them who heartily serve God through Jesus Christ; the one is indeed exegetical of the other, as that which

is plainer is exegetical of that which is less plain; but else they are but the same thing; which appears also in this, that in some creeds the latter words are left out, and particularly in the Constantinopolitan, as being understood to be in effect but another expression of the same article.' Bp Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery*, Pt. II. B. 1. § 1.

A pledge
of unity.

very pressure of external circumstances assisted her to concentrate her forces, and the exclamation wrung from her heathen persecutors, 'See how these Christians love,' shews that in these ages, as in the first infancy of the Church, the Communion of Saints was an inward living reality, that, like the spirit of life, was felt and breathed, and needed not to be memorialized by any outward confession. But when the powers of this world adopted the religion of Christ, as a matter of state policy, fully as much as of conviction of the nullity of every form of pagan belief, the secular element soon shewed itself as a leaven that threatened to penetrate the whole mass through and through; internal discord, heresy, and schism, were the sure results of the altered condition of the Church; and an age of restless ambition and fierce passions ensued, that in great measure displaced the higher matters of faith and practice. In such an age it must indeed have been a blessed thing for the Christian to abstract his regards from the fratricidal scene, to look deeper than things present and immediate, and to view with the eye of faith the calm unruffled love of God, still reigning in the hearts of thousands, who with the Church of the past, and the spirits of just men made perfect, together formed a Communion of Saints, notwithstanding the apparent success, and the momentary ascendancy of the spirit of Antichrist.

Such perhaps may be accepted as the rationale of the addition to the Creed of this article of faith; upon its first incorporation in the Creed, it

expressed the yearning of the Christian spirit for unity and concord, at a time when heresies had made deep havoc of the fold of Christ, and internal schisms had thrown open its defences; unfortunately, the condition of the Church has never since been such, as to enable her to dispense with the expression of this aspiration of faith. At the present day the disciple of Christ in using those words of daily prayer, 'Thy kingdom come,' prays that himself may have communion with the faithful servants of Christ of all ages, that the kingdom of Christ may absorb into itself his own heart and soul, and that the kingdoms of this world, outwardly professing the faith of Christ, may be so inwardly imbued with His Spirit, as to make the Communion of Saints coincident with the external limits of the visible Church, and the Church coextensive with the whole human race.

A pledge
of unity.

This article of faith, therefore, has been retained in the Creed with strict propriety, as being a pledge and earnest of complete unity of spirit at some future time. The words of our Saviour's prayer, and the spirit of that prayer in action, are the means, omnipotent with God, to obtain its complete realisation.

It has been already said, that the final clauses in the Creed are arranged after the confession of faith in the Godhead and Power of the Holy Ghost, because the states and measures of grace, that they involve, are referrible to his ever merciful agency. The Holy Spirit has fostered the growth of the Church from the beginning. Striving with man

The forgiveness of
sins.

Position
Neh. ix. 20.

before the deluge; manifesting himself as the inward light of holy men and patriarchs; guiding his people in their wanderings; shrouded in the cloud of glory between the Cherubims; inspiring his servants the prophets; and in the end descending, as a plentiful outpouring of divine life and energy, upon the 'Church of the first-born written in heaven,' as well as on the first fruits to Christ of the Gentiles. In the same way, the forgiveness of sins is, in part at least, the result of His merciful Presence, connected inseparably as they both are with the Sacrament of Baptism; for the Creed, in speaking of the remission of sins, evidently has in view the sacramental washing away of sin through Baptism in the Church. The consideration of these words will lead us to consider, first, the bearing of the clause; next, the point of time from whence remission of sins is to be dated; and thirdly, the present practical results that must be inseparable from a true remission of sins.

I. The ancient Creeds, in one way or another, connect the doctrine of remission of sins with the collation of the Holy Spirit in Baptism. The Creed found in the Apostolical Constitutions declares that the Holy Ghost 'hath wrought in God's saints from the beginning of the world, and was sent forth, upon the Apostles and upon all of the Holy Catholic Church, (i. e. who were baptized,) who believe in the resurrection of the flesh, the remission of sins, the kingdom of heaven, and the life of the world to come.' The Creed of Jerusalem expresses faith in the efficacy of 'one bap-

tism of repentance for the remission of sins;' and this clause intervening as it does between the confession of faith in the Holy Ghost, and in one holy Catholic Church, connects the efficacy of Baptism on the one hand with the operation of the Holy Ghost, and on the other it implies that Baptism is the only visible means whereby believers may obtain remission of sins, and an entrance into the visible Church of Christ. Similarly, the Church of the South expressed confession of faith in the remission of sins as ministerially conveyed by the Church in Baptism. St Cyprian observing that heretics, and those in schism, can shew no plea for their baptismal use of the Creed of the Church, says; 'Nam cum dicunt, *Credis remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam per Sanctam Ecclesiam*, mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habeant Ecclesiam.' Epiphanius also confesses in his shorter Creed *ἐν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*, while in the longer form it is expressed as *ἐν βάπτισμα μετάνοιας*: in either case he connects remission of sins with the sacrament. In the same way the Nicene Creed in its fullest form declares faith in 'One Baptism for the remission of sins;' and the position which the clause occupies in the Creed suggests that, as the Holy Ghost is the very life and quickening influence of the Church at large; so, in the case of individual members of the Church, that it is His presence in the soul that seals to us the remission of sins, purchased for us by the merits of Christ; Baptism being the instru-

in the
Creed.

Original-
tion. ment ordained of Christ for communicating the
 holy influence to the believer.

II. Justification, therefore, whether considered as the act whereby God absolves the sinner from guilt, and pronounces him innocent, for the sake of Christ's merits; or viewed, by virtue of His gift of grace, as the first germ of a new life of holiness, is coincident with Baptism. The Lord's baptism is a true type of the disciple's. He was justified in the Spirit, when the voice of the Father pronounced him to be His beloved Son, the express image of Him who is Holiness itself; eternally and absolutely holy, as the Father is holy; and that declaration from heaven was neither preceded nor followed, but accompanied by the Holy Ghost descending and resting upon Christ. After the same order also the believer is justified in Baptism. A trusting faith, itself a fruit of preventing grace, leads the recipient to the Holy Font, casting himself entirely and unreservedly upon God's mercy through Christ. God of his free grace accepts that faith, and bestowing his Holy Spirit, views the believer no longer as a lost sinner, but as His child by adoption and grace. From that time he must be raised from the death of sin by the power of the Spirit, as Christ was 'declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of Holiness by the resurrection of the dead.' Fresh members are thus added to the Church, the Body of Christ, and kept in the way of life.

Rom. i. 4.

It is evident, indeed, that man can only de-

scribe these several steps in the work of grace, in ^{in Baptism.} logical and consecutive order; if the soul attempts to realise to itself any deeper or more comprehensive view of the Divine scheme, the clouds of darkness that surround the throne of God are an effectual barrier to the presumptuous attempt. Great is the mystery of godliness, the incarnation of which is Christ; the mystery also of each sinner's redemption in the Church, the Body of Christ predestined from all eternity, is scarcely less oppressive to our sense of awe and religious fear. But this we know, that it must be an entire redemption for all who live and die in the Lord, involving daily measures of spiritual strength, as well as forgiveness for the past. It is a redemption, also, worked out for us not only by Christ's death upon the cross, but by all that he did and suffered for us in life, by all that he was, or is, or ever will be, in relation to our souls and bodies. The entire mediatorial work of Christ is the atonement whereby we are reconciled to God. 'For if, when we were ^{Rom. v. 10.} enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.' If he died for our sins, 'he was raised again for our justification.' In this way the death of Christ has a sanctifying as well as a justifying efficacy; it is 'the blood of Christ that ^{1 John i. 7.} cleanseth us from all sin,' and gives the power to walk as children of light, by purging 'the con- ^{Heb. ix. 14.} science from dead works to serve the living God.' And for all the remaining power which sin must still possess over every son of Adam, 'we have an ^{1 John ii. 2.}

Justifica-
tion.

advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins.' Thus the sacrifice of Christ's death is of a continuous efficacy; Christ died indeed once for all, and we are baptized into that precious death once for all; but from that hour, whether by his Holy Incarnation and Nativity; whether by his meritorious Cross and Passion, or by his precious death and burial, or by his glorious resurrection and ascension, by the holy life and death of Christ we are saved.

From these observations it will be observed, that when we speak of being justified by faith, we must mean a comprehensive faith, embracing every part of the gracious Saviour's character, and proposing to itself a sincere imitation of the Saviour's example, so far as God supplies the strength to follow where absolute Holiness has led the way. When we speak of the remission of sins, we cannot disjoin the act of grace from the gift of the Spirit of Christ. Whether, therefore, we consider the benefit of Baptism to be justification from sin, or regeneration to a new life of holiness, or adoption among the number of God's children, these blessed results flow directly from the Cross of Christ; but the sure seal is still the same, the gift of the Holy Spirit of Christ; 'but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.' Without this purification by the Spirit, the guilt of sin must still have remained, the old Adam unredeemed, the will unregenerate, the child of sin as much as ever exposed to the wrath of God. It is a

1 Cor. vi. 11.

sound theology that teaches, that 'He that was born *for* us upon his Incarnation, is born *within* us upon our regeneration.' And the collective body of individual souls thus quickened by the Spirit of Christ, each after its measure for receiving the good gift, forms the body of Christ the Church, having the holy hope of being in some degree, at least, 'conformed to the image' of the Son of God upon earth, and in the end wholly assimilated to the likeness of his glorious body in heaven.

The Holy Spirit being conferred in Baptism, together with remission of sins as a co-ordinate result of faith in Christ, the believing soul becomes as a temple of God; and 'The temple of the Lord is holy.' The presence of Christ consists not with the bondage of sin; the one power must drive forth the other. The will must be emancipated, as an act of grace, second only in importance to the soul's justification from sin. For regeneration means nothing conceivable, if it does not mean the reduction of man's rebellious will into harmony with the will of God, 'As thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, John xvii. 21. that they also may be one in us.' Sin from the first has been the spiritual discord of man's will set in array against the divine will. Adam's will in Paradise was at first wholly one with the will of God; and to obey was to enjoy a state of most perfect freedom, because the conscience and affections went along with the will, and made obedience spontaneous, the free-will offering of the heart. But so soon as man's will became estranged from this close unison with the will of God, sin was born into the

Regenera-
tion.
Bp Pearson.

The will world, and a discord introduced, that was never again to be resolved, until the whole counsel of God should have been fulfilled by the seed of the woman.

It is in this aspect especially that Scripture teaches us to view sin. 'Whatsoever is not of faith is sin:' for faith is a purifying principle, and regards with a single eye the word and will of God; and without such self-denying faith it is impossible to please him. The bondage of sin, under which man languishes by nature, consists in a blind following of self and selfish instincts, to the utter disregard of all that is high and holy. And, in proportion as man is redeemed from this perverse will, he finds a true liberty of action in obeying Him

2 Cor. iii. 17. whose service is perfect freedom. 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' This emancipation of the will, is man's true spiritual regeneration; and it was a full appreciation of these more perfect measures of grace that prompted the Apostle's words, 'But God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.' His own will was harmonised with the will of God. Again, 'All unrighteousness is sin;' as being essentially opposed to the will of Him who is the holy and righteous Lord God. 'The carnal mind is enmity against God.' And why? 'Because it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be,' so long as it is carnal and stubborn and rebellious. And this carnal state expresses the

Gal. vi. 14. natural condition of every child of Adam. 'The

Gal. v. 17.

flesh, that is, man's natural will, lusteth against ^{regenerate.} the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.' 'The ^{Eph. ii. 2.} Spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience' 'lusteth to envy.' And man's redemption ^{James iv. 5.} from evil practically consists in the gift of the Spirit of God, overruling for good 'the spirit of man that is in him.' 'We have received, not the spirit ^{1 Cor. ii. 12.} of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.' 'That ye put off concerning the former ^{Eph. iv. 22—24.} conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.' To weak and sinful flesh and blood, conscious of much abiding infirmity, these precise and definite terms of Scripture, whereby the spiritual union of Man with God is declared to us, are an unfathomed deep of marvel. Of individual members of Christ, the Word asserts that 'he ^{1 Cor. vi. 17.} that is joined unto the Lord is one Spirit;' 'unto ^{Eph. iv. 7.} every one of us is given grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ,' God having 'sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba, Father;' and in still more awful terms, it is declared that, as members of Christ, we are 'builded ^{Eph. ii. 22.} together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.' 'Ye are the temple of the living God; as ^{2 Cor. vi. 16.} God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them.' 'Know ye not that ye are the temple of ^{1 Cor. iii. 16.} God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?' 'Which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?' ^{1 Cor. vi. 19, 20.}

Reconcilia-
tion For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify
God in your body, and in your spirit, which are
God's.' Spiritual regeneration, therefore, in Baptism,
involves a true and literal indwelling of the Holy
Spirit; without it, the grace of Baptism is null and
void.

III. Remission of sins, then, is conferred in
Baptism, when the original taint of our nature is
corrected, and forgiveness for the past is vouchsafed,
but the act of grace, to continue valid, must be
made manifest in present practical results; 'The
Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we
are the children of God;' and the Spirit of Christ
can never be a dormant, inactive quality; the sup-
position were a palpable irreverence; it consists
not in inward feelings and mere latent excellence,
but it has an outward existence in the various fruits
of the Spirit, that are as open to the moral per-
ception, as the outward and visible sign in a Sacra-
ment is externally perceptible to the bodily sense.
Rom. viii. 16. 'Hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep
his commandments.' For the fruits of the Spirit
are such outward and patent gifts as, 'love, joy,
peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith,
meekness, temperance,' every one of which are
highly practical qualities, engendering in others
also their own similitude. Now, since none of
these qualities are the natural dowry of man, since
also it is necessary that they be acquired and assi-
milated by the spirit of man in his regenerate state,
we may see in this the reason why, in speaking of
the atonement made by Christ, the Apostle should

so continually express himself, as though the change were wholly made in man. 'Be ye reconciled to God;' the verb *καταλλάσσεσθαι* implying a substantive change, rather than a passive reconciliation; to be reconciled truly, is to undergo a moral change relatively to another; but that change is always spoken of in Scripture as taking place in man, and not in God, whose essential attribute it is to exist eternally *ἀτρέπτως*, *ἀναλλοιώτως*. Such is Chrysostom's doctrine; 'The Apostle saith not, reconcile God to yourselves; for it is not He that is in a state of enmity, but yourselves; for God hateth not at all;' and shortly before, 'For He hath not changed us in such a sense as still to leave us in a state of enmity, but by making us friends of Him.....but of this also He is the cause; it is not that we have betaken ourselves to Him, but that He hath called us.' Elsewhere he writes in the same strain, and interprets the term *καταλλάσσειν* by other expressions of St Paul, as implying a state and gift, resulting from the death of Christ.

through
Christ.

¹ Καὶ οὐκ εἶπε, καταλλάξατε ἑαυτοῖς τὸν Θεόν. Οὐ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἐστὶν ὁ ἐχθραίνων, ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς. Θεὸς γὰρ οὐδέποτε ἐχθραίνει. *Comm. in 2 Cor. v. 20.*

Οὐ γὰρ ἀφείς μένειν ἐχθροὺς, οὕτως ἡμᾶς ἡμεῖψατο· ἀλλὰ φίλους ποιήσας ἑαυτῷ.....οὐ γὰρ ἡμεῖς αὐτῷ προσεδράμομεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ἐκάλεσε. 18.

Τρίτον δὲ, ὅτι κατήλλαξεν, ὅτι ἔσωσεν, ὅτι ἐδικαίωσεν, ὅτι ἀθανάτους ἐποίησεν, ὅτι υἱοὺς ἐιργάσατο καὶ κληρονόμους· οὐ τοῖνυν ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου μόνον ἰσχυρίζεσθαι χρὴ, φησιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ θά-

ρου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν διὰ τοῦ θανάτου. *Rom. v. 10.*

The various passages of the New Testament in which the verb *καταλλάσσειν* and its derivatives occur, all make the sinner to be the subject of the action implied in it, as may be seen by consulting Schleusner; the caution therefore that he suggests is superfluous: 'Jam cum ad Deum transfertur hoc verbum ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, necessario θεοπρεπῶς explicandum est, ut notio iræ ac vindictæ plane removeatur.'

Ancient interpretation.

‘In the third place, the Apostle says, that he hath reconciled us, that he hath saved us, that he hath justified us, that he hath conferred immortality upon us, that he hath made us sons and heirs. Wherefore he saith, we may not only have confidence by reason of his death, but by reason of the gift bestowed upon us, by means of that death.’ St Augustine concurs in the same view of our reconciliation to God. ‘For¹ we are not reconciled to Him otherwise than through love, whereby we are also called sons; no longer now as slaves under the dominion of fear, because “perfect love casteth out fear;” and we have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. And since, being reconciled, and brought back to a state of friendship by love, we may know all the mysteries of God; therefore it is said of the Holy Spirit, “He shall lead you into all truth.”’ Elsewhere, he says, with more definite precision; ‘For² he be-

¹ ‘Non enim reconciliamur illi nisi per dilectionem, qua etiam filii appellamur, non jam sub timore tamquam servi, quia consummata dilectio foras mittit timorem; et *Spiritum libertatis accepimus in quo clamamus Abba Pater*. Et quia reconciliati et in amicitiam revocati per caritatem poterimus omnia Dei secreta cognoscere, propterea de Spiritu Sancto dicitur, *Ipse vos inducet in omnem veritatem*.’ Aug. *de Fide et Symb.* 19.

² ‘Non enim ex quo ei reconciliati sumus per sanguinem Filii ejus, nos cepit diligere; sed ante mundi constitutionem dilexit nos, ut cum ejus Unigenito etiam nos filii ejus essemus, prius quam omnino aliquid

essemus. Quod ergo reconciliati sumus Deo per mortem Filii ejus, non sic audiatur, non sic accipiatur, quasi ideo nos reconciliaverit ei Filius, ut jam inciperet amare quos oderat; sicut reconciliatur inimicus inimico, ut deinde sint amici, et invicem diligant, qui oderant invicem; sed jam nos diligenti reconciliati sumus ei, cum quo propter peccatum inimicitias habebamus.’ Aug. *in Joh. Tract.* cx. 6.

In a far different spirit are those words of Calvin conceived, wherein he discusses the point, ‘Quomodo conveniat, Deum, qui nos misericordia sua prævenit, fuisse inimicum, donec per Christum nobis reconciliatus est;’ and afterwards, ‘Sic

gan not to love us from the time when we became reconciled to him by the blood of His Son; but before the foundation of the world he loved us, so that with the Only-begotten we also were his sons, even before we had any substantial existence. When we read, therefore, that we are reconciled to God by the death of His Son, let not the term be so accepted or understood, as though the Son should have reconciled us to him in such a sense, as to cause Him to commence loving those, whom hitherto he had viewed with hate; as foe may be said to be reconciled to foe, and whereby they who mutually hated each other, become friends, and mutually love. But now we are reconciled to him who always loved us, but with whom we were at enmity by reason of sin.' Reconciliation, as the fathers understood the term, is the practical result of justification, shewing itself in the altered principles of the regenerate will; and by no means, as a later theology has interpreted it, exhibiting an altered mode of the Divine Mind. Reconciliation with them is the habitual state of the heart sanctified by grace, it is the Christian correlative of natural evil; and where modern divinity speaks of reconciliation as affecting God, apart from man, the fathers consider it rather as the effect of God's good grace working in man.

Thus much then we have seen, that the Remission of sins confessed by us in the Creed, is coinci-

Ancient interpretation.

instituihur sacra doctrina, ut sine Christo Deum nobis quodammodo infestum cernamus, et ejus manum

in exitium nostrum armatam.' Calvin, *Instit.* II. 16. 2.

Conclusion. dent with Baptism; that it is accompanied by the gift of God's Holy Spirit; also, that while it denotes a full and free forgiveness of every shade of sin that is past; it involves likewise a regenerate heart and will for the future, as the mark and badge of our reconciliation to God.

The resur-
rection of
the body,

Rom. viii.
10, 11.

Eph. ii. 4-6.

There is a certain degree of Scriptural coherence between this clause and the preceding. In St Paul's writings at least, nothing is so suggestive of a bodily resurrection from the cheerless gloom and corruption of the grave, as justification from sin, and regeneration in the spirit; 'If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.' 'God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.' The doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, seems to find its place naturally after a confession of faith in the resurrection of soul and spirit from the death of sin, by a plenary remission. We are here led to consider, that the resurrection of man is in close analogy with his first formation; and that it is a doctrine that supplies the only key to various difficulties in God's moral government of the world, that are otherwise wholly inexplicable.

I. With regard to the first of these two points offered for consideration, although our own death be, in the strict meaning of the word, a dissolution of the various particles of which the human body consists, still the breaking down of the entire organism of the human frame that results, is in no respect inconsistent with the notion of a rearrangement of the scattered particles, and their reorganization in the same individual body that was dissolved in death. For there is no annihilation of a single atom in the process of decay; the air claims back its own; the earthy portions mingle with their kindred dust; and the more fluid elements are separated from them, either to be absorbed as vapour by the air, or to be held in saturation by the earth, or to be mingled with other fluids on the surface. But in all this, we can conceive no annihilation of a single particle; though separate, and restored once more to their first rudimental condition, they still exist; and are ready to enter into those new combinations, and conditions of utility, for which they are destined by the Creator. Now we may imagine that it was out of elementary particles thus floating loosely as it were, and disengaged, upon the face of creation, that Adam was first framed. At least we can attach no other meaning to the Scriptural account, that he was formed out of the dust of the earth, than that the various molecules of heterogeneous matter, found by analysis to compose the physical substance of man, were collected together, and had an organic condition of existence bestowed upon

analogi-
cally con-
sidered.

With what
body them, which was wholly wanting in their separate and free state. But this is exactly the same manifestation of power, that would be exerted in restoring man once more to himself. The one, therefore, is not more incredible than the other. The first man we know, by the natural analysis of death, to have been created out of kindred matter to the earth on which he was placed; what has once happened, may take place again; and the body of Adam, though reduced to its original elements, may be raised again, and its various particles may be organized once more, by the same power that created him at first. Further, if there is no difficulty in supposing that our first parent shall be raised again to life, there is no greater difficulty in imagining a multiplication of the same display of Almighty power, whereby the whole race of his descendants shall be summoned back to life. It matters not that they received their first life after a different order from the generation of Adam. The elements of which they are composed are still the same; and the word of might that recalls one into a state of sensation and life, can cause millions of similar creatures to be the beings that they were before. By this reasoning, therefore, we may conclude, that the simple fact of man's existence upon earth, is proof that he may be restored again to life, after the entire reduction, by the hand of death, of the different particles of his body into their simple primæval elements.

But a difficulty perhaps may be raised with respect to the doubt met by the Apostle; and hav-

ing disposed of the question, 'How are the dead raised up?' some man may still ask, 'With what body do they come?' The subject is full of mystery. It is certain that the component elements of one human body may enter into the composition of another by assimilation, and be a second time resolved from bodily organization in death. A hard-fought field of battle will, for many generations, restore to man in after crops of grain, the dissolved elements of the slaughtered host. The same particles may thus re-enter into several human bodies at far distant periods of time. To which individual body then will these particles belong, that may have been common to many? The Apostle's answer must be our guide. In the first place, he speaks of a great positive change. And the body that now is, is as different from the body that shall be, as corruption and dishonour and weakness, and that which is altogether animal, is different from incorruption and glory and power, and that which is essentially spiritual. Since flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, on the principle that corruption cannot inherit incorruption, a mighty change must take place in our vile bodies, before they can be made like unto Christ's glorious body. Thus St Paul would seem to draw a distinction between the elementary matter of which man is composed, and which, in its ultimate elements, cannot be identified as human, and the organized being man, which does admit of being individually discerned; between the atomic rudiments of flesh

do they
come?

1 Cor. xv. 35.

With what
body

and bone, and thew and sinew, that are buried in the earth as seed, and the glorified body that is raised again as the radiant flower, or the golden ear. The seed is committed to the ground and decays; the ear is not in its thousandth part composed of the individual atoms that have been dissolved; the single grains, that help to form the ripened ear, may have fewer or more molecules of matter in common with the embryo. They receive their organism indeed from the grain sown, but they draw the atoms of matter constituting the aggregate plump and rounded form, not from the seed, but from the mother of all, the earth.

1 COR. XV. 37, 38. 'That which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain: but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.' So too, the flesh of men and beasts and birds, are, chemically speaking, very nearly identical; their organic properties also are very much alike; being convertible, the one into the other, by an easy process of assimilation; but to the individuals again of the animal creation God giveth a body as it hath pleased him, and to every kind his own body; and whether it pleased God to raise man in the identical substance, formed from food already assimilated, or to reorganize his body from the original elements of that food, elsewhere dispersed, the organization being identical, and above all, the living soul unaltered, the individual would be the same. Various primary atoms might now

for the first time enter into his bodily constitution, but his personal identity would in no essential particular be affected. do they
come?

So again, 'There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differeth from another star in glory;' the substance of each star in its constituent elements of matter may be the same; they may in their physical nature be, one and all, homogeneous with the earth that we inhabit, and yet each have a distinctly individual character of light and glorious brilliancy belonging to itself, and itself alone, such as the great Creator has bestowed upon it. Now we might imagine these worlds dissolved by the power that made them, and their various dissociated atoms dispersed throughout the universe; and then again collected, and formed once more into the worlds that they were before. Whether or no the selfsame atoms re-entered into their formation might be immaterial; if they were invested with the same intrinsic glory, the same peculiar characteristic excellencies, their individual nature would be no other than it was before; the interchange of similar particles between planet and planet would no more involve a loss of identity in each, than the shifting structure of our own bodies, whereby a constant process of loss and reparation is going on in us, affects our own personal identity from one period of life to another. The white wreath of cloud, that gathers around some lofty mountain-peak, remains fixed, in spite of the passing breeze; as particles of the 1 Cor. xv. 41.

With what ^{body} thin vapour float away and are lost, other volumes of mist creeping up from below take their place, and become embodied in the stationary cloud. Such also is our own identity, notwithstanding the

James iv. 14. momentary change we undergo. 'What is your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away;' and the process is continuous.

1 Cor. xv. 40. Once more: 'There are celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another;' the first man, noble and full of dignity as the body may be, with which God has endowed him, is of this earth earthy; but the second man, even upon earth, had so glorious a majesty impressed upon his whole being, that men could not refrain from worshipping him; and now he is the King of Glory. But by a mighty change, the mode of which must still be a mystery to the end, this corruptible shall put on incorruption; this mortal shall put on immortality; and the frame that is of these gross and earthy particles, 'shall be fashioned like unto

1 Cor. xv. 49. Christ's glorious body;' so that, 'as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.' Now who shall declare the nature of this transfiguration? If we are assured that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, who shall say what characteristic elements of our corruptible earthy nature shall be purged away in that glorious change, and left behind? The very accidents of the material flesh, that render it liable to be so dissolved and broken

down, as to enable it to be assimilated by others of God's creatures, mark it out to be corruptible; but corruption cannot inherit incorruption; and what intellect can conceive the heavenly mystery, that our body shall be the same though changed; such as we lived and breathed on earth, yet greatly altered? incapable as the body is on earth for life in heaven, in heaven it shall be no longer fit for the life that is of earth. Even the adorable body of Christ gave proof of this change between the Resurrection and Ascension. No seclusion was impenetrable to his altered body, but suddenly, 'when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst;' and again in eight days, 'when the disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst.' And yet he gave the same sure proof, that any mere mortal man could give, of the reality of his bodily substance; 'Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.' 'Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb. And he took it, and did eat before them.' And this altered condition of the Lord's body, too heavenly for earth, too material for spirit, may help perhaps to explain the two commands of contrary purport, whereby on one occasion our Lord charged the unbelieving, 'Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faith-

Do they
come?

John xix. 20,
26.

Luke xxiv.
39.

Luke xxiv.
42.

John xx. 27.

‘we shall be changed,’ that is sufficient for us to know; and the change, by spiritualising the matter of which we are formed, must be wholly consistent with the alienation of certain rudimental properties of the earthy and gross.

Life ever-
lasting.

II. God’s moral government also affords strong presumptive evidence, that man’s state of existence shall be renewed to him after death. For ‘He cometh to judge the earth; with righteousness shall he judge the world, and the people with equity.’ Certainly, if we were to confine our view to this present state of things, we might find it not simply difficult, but absolutely impossible, to reconcile the flagrant selfishness, and the callousness of heart, that abound in the world, with any all-wise scheme of moral government. The richest blessings of life appear often to be lavished upon beings that are wholly unworthy of them, and whose enjoyment of life is on a par with the consumption of the fruits of the earth by the lower orders of the animal creation. *Fruges consumere nati*, would seem to be the only feeling of many, into whose lap the world has poured its most abundant treasures. Such fleeting gifts have a direct tendency to tether the senses down to earth, and to blind the owners of them to any higher order of existence. And on the other hand, events, that to the natural man are most bitter with affliction, may be observed to have a chastening virtue; so true is it, that, even in the natural course of the world, the flesh and the spirit ‘are contrary the one to the other.’ Now, how are we to account

Ps. xevi. 13.

Moral
proof

for these facts? That which is satisfying, in a certain sense, to the body, is destruction to the spirit; and the mortification of the outward man may be seen in the nature of things, to be the purification of the soul. Are we to say with the ancient heretic, that spiritual and material substance are the work of two opposing principles? a supposition manifestly absurd, even upon natural grounds, external to scripture, when we take into our account the abundant proof of goodness, that, notwithstanding these anomalies, the world of matter and spirit alike supply. Must we not rather fall back upon the only tenable ground, and say that the moral phenomena of the world are affecting a separation between good and evil, as God formerly separated by his word the Light from the Darkness; that our present condition of discord shall be resolved in harmony; and that the moral government of God will be fully vindicated in a world, that shall dawn upon us, when this earthly state of trial is over? ‘What shall it advantage a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?’ is an apophthegm, under the Christian dispensation, of greater efficacy and virtue, than all the enactments of human wisdom, to restrain the inordinate selfishness of man’s heart, and to prompt to such noble acts of self-sacrifice and love, as can only hope for their reward hereafter.

Luke ix. 25.

Again, the deeper we dive into the dark recesses of the human heart, the stronger is our conviction, that in another world, the hidden mysteries that it contains shall at length be disclosed to the

light of day. The worship of self, mean and grovelling as it is, and always obstructive to the onward progress of the human race, is outdone in villainy by still darker passions. In every depth there is a deeper still. And certainly the proof of an Allwise and Benevolent Creator, derived from the natural tendencies and interadaptation of material objects, would fail to be convincing, if this life were to circumscribe our view. It would be to no effect that we reasoned out the proof of Infinite Wisdom and Goodness from the works of creation, if, in the moral world, we found a mazy tissue of evil without hope of remedy; of vices, not only unpunished, but often rewarded with the fruition of every object of guilty aspiration. Hence the spirit of man has always reclaimed against the notion, that the present order of things is the whole day of his destiny; and there has scarcely ever existed a tribe so wholly benighted, as not to have some faint cognizance of this belief. The truth indeed may have been overlaid with errors of the grossest and wildest complexion; but the bare fact alone that such instinctive faith should exist, has always been a strong argument for the presumption of the reality foreshadowed by it.

of future
life.

For man, independently of revelation, has sufficient reason for supposing that the present state of things is not final. If the harmony of the outward world be of divine appointment, the doctrine of a future life results as a necessary consequence; it is a corollary, as it were, upon the proof of a wise and good Creator in the natural world. The Being

Necessity
of a future
life.

that created us is wise and good, and the demonstration of this admits of mathematical exactness. But being wise and good, we may be sure that the present state of moral disorder cannot be final; and therefore, independently of revelation, the light of nature might lead us to expect the perfect development hereafter of a system of strict impartial justice, and to look for that close application of the eternal Rule of Right, that, comparatively speaking, can only be faintly traced on earth. If now we take into the account the Scriptural assurance, that our present life is a state of trial to the good and to the evil, in which our future destiny is decided according to our actions here, we possess at once the key to the whole of God's present government of us; we see, not only, that we are the subjects of a wise Ruler, who is good as He is wise, but we learn to trace back every dispensation of life, whether joyous or afflictive, to the providential appointment of Him, who weigheth in the balance the children of men. The wisdom and goodness of the Deity having been brought home to our moral sense by outward proof, we are as certain that a future state of existence shall complete that proof of his Wisdom and Goodness, as that the constitution of the outward world presents instances of design, or the enjoyment of sensation affords proof of Benevolence in the Creator. We may of course assume, that the proof of this goodness is only so far defective for the present, as it is in course of being worked out.

So far, therefore, we are led by successive steps

of reasoning, founded upon what may be termed the natural phases of the Divine Attributes, in the works of Creation. Proof of design meets us at every point. The final cause of its exercise is manifestly benevolent. And the moral government of the world is dispensed by the selfsame Infinite Intelligence; with the single postulate, therefore, that unity of system should exist in both the moral and natural dispensation, as proceeding from one source of wisdom, we conclude, that in the moral world, also, there is design in everything that happens; that this design will be found in its widest bearing to be most truly benevolent and just; and in the mean time, since in many cases results are presented to our notice, that, *per se*, we cannot reconcile with the notion of perfect justice and benevolence, we can only look for a future resolution of the difficulty; ‘For he cometh to judge the earth,’ is the sublime teaching of Scripture; ‘with righteousness shall he judge the world, and the people with equity.’

The voice
of
Scripture.

Ps. xcvi. 3.

Natural religion is thus the handmaid of revelation. It is needless to observe that, the doctrine of eternal life is the very voice of the Gospel throughout, from the first words of its preaching, ‘In him was life,’ to its last prayerful preparation for the dawning of life eternal, ‘Even so come, Lord Jesus.’ So completely indeed does this doctrine pervade the whole substance of the Scriptures of the New Testament, that scarce a page can be found, without several allusions to it, more or less direct: as well might

John i. 4.

Rev. xxii. 20.

Jewish
Creed.

we attempt to separate light from the rays of the sun, as eliminate the doctrine of life eternal from any portion of the Gospel of Christ. Life and immortality were brought to light in the Gospel, but it was chiefly by placing in the strong and clear light of truth the belief that previously existed, though greatly obscured by the mists of inveterate prejudice and error.

The Jews perhaps only held half the truth; they believed indeed that the just should rise again to life, as firmly as that the great forefathers of their race, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, had closed their eyes in time, to open them again in eternity. But faint traces are to be discovered of any general popular belief, that the wicked and faithless should be raised again to a state of punishment. In the case already instanced in a former portion of this work, the fourth of the brethren, cruelly put to death by Antiochus, exactly expressed the national belief; ‘It is good, being put to death by men, to look for hope from God, to be raised up again by him; as for thee, thou shalt have no resurrection to life.’ The divine justice was considered to be satisfied, as regards the wicked, by their annihilation at the close of a turbulent, restless life, and by their perpetual banishment from the glory of God’s presence; while the just, however full of affliction and sorrow their earthly life might have been, were as firmly believed to be the heirs of everlasting happiness in Paradise.

2 Mac. vii. 14.

Again, at a still later date, the atheistic philosophy of one at least of the heathen schools, cor-

rupted the ancient faith still further, and as the Jew came into contact with the Greek at the great marts of commerce, the centres of a luxurious civilisation, he learned to reason with men, whose great practical principle was, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' The world's present aspect, and man's darkness as regards the future, as much as any other cause, may have given rise to the ancient forms of atheism. A future day of retribution being unknown, two principal attributes of the Deity, his eternal justice and truth, were veiled from sight; and as the natural result of this ignorance, reasoners 'became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.' In this way evil communication caused that worst condition of the Jews, wherein a future state of existence was wholly denied by a large section of their most influential and wealthy men.

Jewish
Creed.

1 Cor. xv. 32.

Rom. i. 21.

Life and immortality therefore were brought to light by the Gospel, not because Christ first revealed a doctrine wholly unknown to man before; but because he threw a degree of light upon it, that never yet had shone around it, since the day that man first needed the revelation. The Apostle's words, *φωτίσαντος ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν*, are by no means indicative of life, then first brought to light; but of clear light thrown upon the subject of life and immortality, already imperfectly known; as the sun, shining from beneath a dark cloud bathes every object upon which his rays fall in a flood of light, although his dimly diffused rays may previously have shewn the same objects, to a certain

2 Tim. i. 10.

Φωτισαν-
τος ζῶν.

Luke xvi. 20.

Luke xxiii.
43.

extent, in their true colours. Now our Lord has thrown a strong light upon our future life, and its eternal duration. He has also very possibly assured us, that the soul retains its consciousness even between death and the resurrection. The parable of Dives and Lazarus leads straight to this conclusion. And if it be objected that our Lord was speaking in figurative language, there is the ulterior fact of his promise to the dying thief, 'This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' 'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom,' was the prayer of faith; the assurance, that, as the sun should set upon that earthly life, so surely should there dawn, at the selfsame moment, the commencement of fresh life in paradise, was the answer of the prayer. The sleep of death, unconscious of mortal agony or woe, might no doubt be spoken of as a comparative Paradise, but it could hardly be called the kingdom of Christ, that is eminently life everlasting.

cf. Gen. iii.
22.
Deut. v. 40.
Ps. x. 16;
xlv. 7; cxlv.
13.
Isai. xlv. 17.

Lastly, the terms of Scripture that speak of the eternal duration of our future state, whether for good or evil, are very express. In the Hebrew Scripture, לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד and לְעוֹלָם are used to denote eternal duration, as of the Divine Attributes; and the LXX. translators have expressed the term by αἰώνιος. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the term αἰώνιος in the New Testament can only be used in the same sense, and that it is expressive of an unceasing duration of existence. A plain grammatical interpretation is the only one that we are justified in applying to such passages

as speak of the eternity of future punishment; *αἰώνιος*.
 e.g. 'Depart from me, ye cursed, *εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον*, into everlasting fire...and these shall go into everlasting (*αἰώνιον*) punishment, but the righteous into life eternal' (*αἰώνιον*). 'It is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire.' And that there may be no doubt upon the subject, this state of punishment is declared by St Mark to be not only 'eternal,' but the term 'eternal' is shewn to mean unceasing; 'where their worm dieth not, *οὐ τελευτᾷ*, and their fire is not quenched.' It is in vain for modern hermeneutics to endeavour to wring any other sense out of these self-evident terms. The ground-work of our faith is laid firm and sure, upon the plain and grammatical words of Scripture, in every other respect; in these passages, above all others, it is necessary that we should beware of any false dealing towards the souls of men, by 'saying, Peace, peace, where there is no peace.' We can only believe God's word which threatens sin with eternal death, as its doom; but we presume not to fathom the depths of God's unutterable love. 'That which is impossible with man, is possible with God.' He is no austere master, expecting to reap where no good seed has been sown. Having firm faith in this, we may confidently leave the untutored heathen, and the soul of weaker grace in the hands of the All-wise and All-merciful God. 'Them that are without God judgeth.' Thou art no arbiter of their destiny, and well for them that thou art not. 'What is that to thee? follow thou me.'

Matt. xxv. 41.

Mark ix. 44.

Eternal.

All we know is that eternal death is the punishment of sin; and if we can assign no Scriptural limit to its intensity of misery, we can have no manner of doubt with respect to the unceasing blessedness of the redeemed in Christ. 'He that doeth the will of the Lord endureth for ever.' As the working out of man's own vicious inclinations in life must end in death eternal, and as the miserable distraction of passions unsubdued, and a heart unchastened, may form no small portion of the fire that is not quenched; so the will of God, to which the regenerate soul has been gradually moulded upon earth, shall be consummated in the spirit hereafter; and the heaven, of which man obtains a foretaste upon earth, in some favoured moments, at least, of spiritual life, shall be fully revealed within. For the redeemed shall be made wholly one with Christ, and like to his glorious body, and one with God through Him. Even so, blessed Lord, may thy kingdom come, and thy will be done, that thy servants knowing thee upon earth as the Way, the Truth, and the Life, may continue thine for ever and ever. Amen.

THE HISTORY
OF THE
ATHANASIAN CREED.

THE so-called Athanasian Creed was composed the last, in point of time, of the three Creeds, that 'ought thoroughly to be received and believed, Art. VIII. for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.' The Athanasian Creed, though bearing the name of the great champion of the orthodox faith, first saw the light, not in a Greek, but in a Latin form; such Greek copies as exist, being manifestly translations, for the use of the Greek Church, of a creed framed by some writer in the West. But the high antiquity of this exposition of the Catholic Faith is capable of a brief and satisfactory demonstration. Venantius Fortunatus wrote a commentary¹ upon it, as well as upon the Apostles' Creed, somewhere about the year 570, previously to his consecration as Bishop of Poitiers. The genuineness of the work is manifest: the expressions of the commentary bearing

¹ This commentary is found in the *Vind. Cathol.* i. 590.

Composed
in Latin.

a close resemblance to others, that are scattered throughout the works of this writer¹.

The original language in which this Creed was composed was Latin; as is evident from the age and number of Latin MSS. as compared with the Greek. Their general agreement also shews a common stock; while the very remarkable verbal and contextual variations in the few Greek copies, denote as clearly, that they were originally translated by different hands from the Latin, and not transcribed the one from the other. Both internal and external evidence therefore fully warrant the assertion, that this Creed was not the work of Athanasius, but of some Latin writer. Of these Latin copies, the one mentioned by Archbishop Usher², as having been seen by him in the Cottonian collection, is dated by him so early as A.D. 600. One other, the Treves MS., imperfect in the beginning, is also referred to this century; while of the next century, five MSS. are known to exist: the Ambrosian, at Milan, published by Muratori; a copy in K. Athelstan's Psalter in the Cottonian collection; the Colbertine, copied before the time of Charlemagne from the Treves MS., and, like the parent copy, imperfect in its commencement; the Parisian, perfect copy; and the copy written in

¹ Waterland for example quotes the verses;

Non Deus in carnem versus Deus accipit artus:

Non se permutans, sed sibi membra levans.

Unus in ambabus naturis, verus in ipsis

Æqualis matri hinc, par Deitate Patri.

Non sua confundens, &c.—

Ven. Fort. *Carm.* viii. 5. Bibl. P. Tom. x.

² *De Symb. Præf.* ii. 3.

letters of gold, and presented by Charlemagne to Pope Adrian I. in the year 772, which is still preserved at Vienna. After this date MSS. of course are multiplied in a more rapid ratio.

Greek
copies.

Of the Greek copies it is sufficient to say, that Montfaucon¹, the Benedictine editor of the works of Athanasius, had never seen or heard of a copy much older than the Reformation, 'Nullum vidimus Græcum hujus symboli codicem qui trecentorum sit annorum; nec antiquum alium a quopiam visum fuisse novimus.' Some of these Greek copies, also, mention the Procession of the Holy Spirit in a way, that no later Greek writer would deem admissible; for however true it may be, that the clause in the Latin copies of the Creed is so worded as to express two independent facts, to either of which, separately considered, the most fastidious Greek theologian, of any age, would consent, namely, that the Holy Spirit is of the Father and the Son, and that the mode of his personal subsistence is by procession; yet if these two statements were brought into close juxtaposition, so as to raise the inference, that the procession was from the Son as well as from the Father, the Greek notion of orthodox statement would receive a shock; and it would be thought perhaps by the scribe to be a greater crime against the truth to perpetuate the statement, than to correct it by the erasure from the text of the obnoxious word. Hence the variations of the Greek text, in this respect, indicate a western origin; the suspect-

¹ Montf. *Diatrise*, p. 727, as quoted by Waterland.

Greek
copies.

ed word being partially curtailed to accommodate the theological expression to Greek views of orthodoxy. The most ancient writer, that speaks of this Creed in a Greek form, was Nicolas of Otranto, about the year 1200. His copy referred the origin of the Spirit to the Father alone, and its date may be carried perhaps a century higher. But Manuel Caleca, writing about 1360, declares that Greek copies existed long before his time, which affirmed that the Procession was from the Father and the Son; he adds also, that the more ancient Greek writers did not erase the term 'Filioque' from their text, as did later controversialists; and Waterland infers from this, that the Greek copies instanced by Nicolas were late, in comparison with others that contained the suspected term. The Greek MSS. therefore seen by Manuel Caleca would date high in the twelfth century, and we can get no higher. It will not be necessary to notice the later Greek MSS. One thing is certainly remarkable in them, that the 'variæ lectiones' are of a character, that do not admit of being attributed to the mere error and haste of copying; any more than the variations of the English Psalter, that forms part of our Liturgy, as compared with the Version of the Psalms in the Bible, could be accounted for, as the effect of carelessness in successive scribes. They are independent translations, and therefore differ materially in points of context.

This Creed therefore would seem to have been first composed in the Latin language; its earliest

form is the explanation of it by Venantius Fortunatus, written in the middle of the sixth century; and since no commentary would have been needed, so long as the creed was known only to the learned, it is impossible not to allow, that it had already become consecrated to public use, and that, as forming a public confession of faith, a short explanation of it was prepared by the Bishop of Poitiers, for the benefit of the unlearned. It will be seen in the sequel, that its origin may be referred, almost with the certainty of demonstration, to the Gallican branch of the Church Catholic.

Reception
of the
Creed

The Spanish Church, whose Liturgy was borrowed in great measure from the Gallican, exhibits a very familiar acquaintance with this Creed in the seventh century; for, in the fourth council of Toledo, we find a sufficient number of its more striking expressions¹ quoted, to satisfy the mind, that the words of this exposition of the Catholic faith were perfectly well known to the Bishops of that council. Of the German and Anglican Churches it is sufficient to say, that the Creed was translated into the vernacular languages in the ninth century, and annexed, manifestly for Liturgical use, to the Psalter. With regard to Rome, it has already been remarked², that the term ‘Filio-

A.D.
633.

¹ Nec personas confundimus, nec substantiam separamus. Patrem a nullo factum vel genitum dicimus. Filium a Patre non factum, sed genitum asserimus; Spiritum vero Sanctum nec creatum, nec genitum, sed procedentem a Patre et Filio profiteamur; ipsum autem Dominum Jesum Christum.....ex substantia Patris ante sæcula genitum....æqua-

lis Patri secundum Divinitatem, minor Patre secundum Humanitatem,Hæc est Ecclesiæ Catholicæ fides; hanc confessionem conservamus, atque tenemus. Quam quisquis firmissime custodierit, perpetuam salutem habebit. *Conc. Tolet.* iv. cap. 1. ap. Waterland.

² p. 454.

at Rome, que' was most reluctantly admitted into the Nicene formulary; possibly it would always have been repudiated, had it not become the master-word, as it were, in the dark contest between the churches of the East and West. Much in the same way, the Athanasian Creed, appearing first in the Gallican Church, was received at Rome after a long delay. And then the assertion of the origination of the Holy Spirit from the Son, as well as from the Father, may have been an inducement, more powerful than prejudice, to affect the decision of a Church, that had always prided itself on resisting innovation in the order of its ritual. The incorporation, therefore, of this formulary with the offices of the Church of Rome, was rather more tardily accomplished, than was the case with the other Churches in her Communion; and Waterland, for reasons that it will not be necessary to explain at length, assigns its adoption to the year 930. Of the Churches in the Greek communion, not only the more modern Churches of Russia, Muscovy, Bulgaria, Servia, &c. receive the Creed as a genuine production of Athanasius, but the ancient Church of Constantinople also accepted it; cancelling however the term 'Filioque' as a Latin interpolation.

Waterland, whose observations are here condensed, sums up this portion of his interesting work with the following remarks: 'From the foregoing account, it appears that the reception of this Creed has been both general and ancient. It hath been received by Greeks and Latins all over Europe.....so that for generality of reception, the

Athanasian Creed may vie with any, except the Nicene, the only general Creed common to all the Churches. As to the antiquity of its reception into the sacred offices, this Creed has been received in several countries, France, Germany, England, Italy, and Rome itself, as soon or sooner than the Nicene; which is a high commendation of it, as gaining ground by its own intrinsic worth, and without the authority of any general council to enforce it. And there is this thing further to be said for it; that while the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds have been growing up to their present perfection, in a course of years or centuries of years, and not completed till about the year 600, this Creed was made and perfected at once; and is more ancient, if considered as an entire form, than either of the other; having received its full perfection, while the others wanted theirs. No considerable additions or defalcations have been made to it, (it has needed none,) since its first compiling, till of late years, and in the Greek Church only; which yet are so far from correcting or amending the form, that they have rendered it so much the less perfect; and the only way of restoring it to its perfection, is to restore it to what it was at the first¹.

For various critical reasons, Waterland has referred the origin of this Creed to the Gallican Church, just previously to the Ephesine Council in 431; and several considerations having induced him to fix upon Hilary, Bishop of Arles, as the author, he sets down the year 429, in which he was

¹ Waterland, *Crit. Hist.* c. vi.

Its
antiquity

consecrated to his See, as the date of its production; it having been a known custom in the ancient Church for newly-enthroned Bishops to put forth a confession of their faith. Whether or no the Creed be thus correctly traced back to its fountain-head, is of minor importance, as compared with the clear proof of high antiquity that his arguments develope. [The theological definitions of the Creed plainly mark the fact, that they were put forth subsequently to the rise of the Apollinarian heresy, to which notions very pointed allusion is made. And, on the other hand, the commentary by Venantius Fortunatus, about A.D. 570, proves that it was at that date a well-established and accredited formulary of the faith; at least in the Church, of which the writer was a member. If we consider it at that time to have enjoyed a public reputation for a full century, we shall then have circumscribed the date of this Creed's composition, within the definite limits of the first condemnation of the Apollinarian heresy by Damasus A.D. 375 and the year 470. But there is no reason why this Creed may not have existed some years previously to this latter date; and if a sufficient reason can be adduced from the history of the times, to shew, that certain facts took place within the assigned limits, which must have affected the composition of this Creed, but are passed over in silence, we shall in this case be fully warranted in asserting, that the Creed was written previously to the existence of those facts.

Now in two instances this critical assumption is

remarkably verified; and the doctrinal position taken up by the orthodox party, first in the Council of Ephesus A.D. 431, and subsequently at Chalcedon A.D. 451, and entirely ignored in the expressions of this Creed, is a convincing proof that it was written before the earliest of those two Synods. First, then, as regards the Council of Chalcedon, the heretical tenets condemned by the Fathers of the Church, upon that occasion, were those of the Eutychian party, who denied that there were two distinct natures in the one Person of Christ, the perfect Godhead and the perfect Manhood. The heresy indeed had long been smouldering; from the days of Apollinaris we may observe occasional traces of the distinctive errors of the party, subsequently headed by Eutyches; but as in the case of Arianism, Arius became the head of a party, whose first rise may be referred to the preceding generation; so also Eutyches gave his name to a heresy, that sprung from the embers of the Apollinarian party, and by teaching errors called from him, Eutychian, brought himself under the censure of the Church. The particular shade of error expressed by Eutychianism was, that there were two natures in our Lord before the Incarnation, and but one mixed nature after¹. Apollinaris never allowed that our Lord had a true human nature, 'of reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting;' the Logos with him supplied the place of the

critically
defined

¹ Thus the words of Eutyches are quoted by Leo, in his celebrated epistle to Flavianus, 'Confiteor ex duabus naturis fuisse Dominum nos-

trum ante adunationem, post adunationem vero unam naturam confiteor.' Leo M. *ad Flav.* 6. *Vind. Cath.* I. 215.

from theo-
logical
notes.

soul, while the body, to which it was united, was no true human body like ours; but a body, that was not only heavenly and uncreate, but even consubstantial with the Divine Nature of the Word¹; for which reason it was logically inferred, and laid to his charge, that he introduced a fourth distinct person into the Trinity².

Eutychianism therefore sprung out of the Apollinarian heresy, but was essentially distinct from it, though it was not a whit less wild; affirming in fact that impossible commixture of divine and human substance, after the Incarnation, which the Apollinarian imagined in anticipation of it. The orthodox faith, as defined by the Council of Chalcedon, is very express in condemning the notion of a 'duality of Sons;' which was in fact involved antecedently to the Eutychian *συναλοιφή*; it also denies any commixture of the two natures, and the passibility of the divine nature of the Only Begotten; as well as the older Apollinarian notion, that Christ's was no true human body, but a body altogether of a heavenly origin, and essentially divine in its nature. From the date of the Council of Chalcedon every definition of faith was couched in similarly precise terms, and there can be no doubt that the author of the Athanasian Creed,

¹ Οὐ καὶ τὴν ἀσέβειαν ἐξειπεῖν φοβερὸν. It is necessary to verify the assertion of so gross a fact. Athanasius, speaking of the Apollinarian party, says of them, Ποτὲ μὲν ἄκτιστον καὶ ἐπουράνιον λέγοντες τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σάρκα, ποτὲ δὲ, ὁμοούσιον τῆς θεότητος· εἰτά

φασιν, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔσθθαι ἐν ἡμῖν ἀνθρώπου, νοῦς ἐπουράνιος ἐν Χριστῷ. *de Inc.* 2. *Vind. Cath.* i. 140. The same again is stated in the former book, 16; *Vind. Cath.* i. 280. See also *Vind. Cath.* Index, v. Apollinaristæ.

² See Commentary on verse 32.

possessing an intimate knowledge of the varying phases of heresy, as they had existed down to his own time, and intent upon expressing a definite and clearly intelligible exposition of the Catholic Faith, would have been particularly careful in the confutation of Eutychianism, if the heresy had been prior to it in point of time. Now how does the matter really stand? Where the Council of Chalcedon condemns all who infringe the mystery of the Incarnation, and hold a duality of Sons, it infers that two distinct substances, divine and human, were asserted by the Eutychians to have been commingled, so as to make but one; whereas, before this commixture, there must have been a duality of persons, as well as a duality of substances¹. The Eutychian heresy never taught that Christ after this union was any other than one Christ; and the words of the Athanasian Creed, that at first sight may appear to have a bearing on Eutychian error, are in fact beside the purpose. To have this application, the clause, ‘*Qui licet Deus sit et Homo, non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus,*’ must have had the different turn, ‘*Non duo unquam, sed unus semper fuit Christus.*’ The words in fact are not advanced in refutation of heresy, but in vindication of the Catholic faith against a cavil of the Apolli-

Internal
evidence of
date.

¹ Τοῖς τε γὰρ εἰς υἱὼν δυνάδα τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας διασπᾶν ἐπιχειροῦσι μυστήριον, παρατάττεται· καὶ τοὺς παθητὴν τοῦ Μονογενοῦς λέγειν πολμῶντας τὴν Θεότητα, τοῦ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀπωθεῖται συλλόγου· καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν δύο φύσεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ κρᾶσιν, ἡ σύγχυσις ἐπινοοῦσιν ἀνθίσταται· καὶ τοὺς οὐ-

ρανίον, ἡ ἐτέρας τινὸς, ὑπάρχειν οὐσίας τὴν ἐξ ἡμῶν ληφθεῖσαν αὐτῷ τοῦ δούλου μορφὴν, παραπαίοντας ἐξελαύνει· καὶ τοὺς δύο μὲν πρὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως φύσεις τοῦ Κυρίου μυθεύοντας, μίαν δὲ μετὰ τὴν ἔνωσιν ἀναπλάττοντας ἀναθεματίζει. *Definitio Fidei ap. Conc. Chalc. Vind. Cath.* III. 41.

Internal
evidence of
date.

narian party. They charged the Catholic doctors with teaching a divided Christ, and accused them of 'Man-worship.' For instance, 'Ye say again, we worship not the creature. Senseless beings! Wherefore do ye not perceive, that it is not the created body of the Lord, that receiveth the creature's worship, for the Body is of the uncreated Word; to whom therefore the Body pertaineth, to Him offer also worship. Wherefore of a truth he is duly worshipped, and worshipped as God¹.' Again, in the same treatise, 'In the same way ye falsely accuse us, and say that we affirm a duality of Sons, and stigmatise us as Man-worshippers,' &c. The words, now adduced from the Creed, meet this invidious calumny of the Apollinarian party, but have no allusion to Eutychian error: a conclusion already arrived at in a different way by Waterland.

Again, it was a prominent feature in the Eutychian heresy, that it involved the passibility of the Divine Nature in Christ. For the true sufferings of Christ were not denied; but by reason of the inter-combination of the two natures, the one was made to suffer equally with the other. Hence Leo

¹ Ἄλλα πάλιν λέγετε· ὅτι ἡμεῖς κτίσματι οὐ προσκυνούμεν, ὡ ἀνόητοι· διατί οὐ λογίζεσθε, ὅτι καὶ ποιηθὲν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου, οὐ κτιστὴν ἀποφέρεται τὴν προσκύνησιν; τοῦ γὰρ ἀκτίστου Λόγου γέγονε σῶμα· οὐ γὰρ σῶμα γέγονε, τοῦτω προσάγετε καὶ τὴν προσκύνησιν. ἄρ' οὖν καὶ προσκυνεῖται ὀφειλομένως, καὶ θεϊκῶς προσκυνεῖται. Athan. *de Inc. Jesu Chr.* 6.

Vind. Cath. i. 146.

Τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ἡμεῖς συκοφαντοῦντες, λέγετε, ἡμᾶς δύο λέγειν υἱοῦς, καὶ ἀνθρωπολάτρας ἡμᾶς ὀνομάζετε. *Ibid.* p. 169.

It was retorted by Gregory of Nazianzum, that the Apollinarian, according to his tenets, must be a worshipper of the flesh, ὡς σὺ σαρκολάτρης, εἴπερ ἀνθρωπολάτρης ἐγώ. *Ad Cledon.* i.

writes to Flavianus on the subject of Eutyches; ^{Internal evidence of date.}
 ‘Blind as he is with respect to the nature of the Body of Christ, he must needs be no less ignorantly blind as regards the Passion. For if he do not deny the verity of the Cross of Christ, nor doubt the reality of the penalty suffered for the salvation of the world, let him also acknowledge the true human nature of Him, in whose death he believes. Neither let him disbelieve that he was a man of our substance, whom he allows to have been capable of suffering; since the denial of a real fleshly nature, is the denial also of bodily passion.’ For this reason Leo declares, ‘The Son of God is said to have been crucified and buried; but he suffered these things, not in the Divine Nature, whereby the Only Begotten is coeternal and consubstantial with the Father, but in the weakness of Man’s Nature².’ Now where do we find any trace in the Athanasian Creed of such an error? As regards the Passion all that is declared is this, ‘Qui passus est pro salute nostra. Descendit ad Inferos.’ Had the Creed followed upon the steps of the later heresy, some more definite expression must have appeared on the face of it, as regards

¹ Caligans vero circa naturam corporis Christi, necesse est ut etiam in passione ejus eadem obsecatione desipiat. Nam si crucem Domini non putat falsam, et susceptum pro mundi salute supplicium, verum fuisse non dubitat: cujus credit mortem, agnoscat et carnem. Nec diffiteatur nostri corporis hominem, quem cognoscit fuisse passibilem: quoniam negatio veræ carnis, nega-

tio est etiam corporeæ passionis. Leo M. *Ep. ad Flavianum*, 5. *Vind. Cath.* i. 215.

² Filius Dei crucifixus dicitur ac sepultus, cum hæc non in divinitate, qua Unigenitus consempiternus et consubstantialis est Patri, sed in naturæ humanæ sit infirmitate perpassus. Leo M. *Ep. ad Flav.* 5. *Vind. Cath.* i. 213.

Internal
evidence of
date.

p. 572.

the Nature in which alone our Lord suffered; just as the Council of Chalcedon found it necessary to anathematise the denial, that the humiliation of Christ referred to any other than a true human body; and indicated that Eutyches, by imagining one mixed and confused nature in Christ¹, virtually taught the Passibility of the Only Begotten. Apollinarianism, no doubt, involved the passibility of the Godhead². But it will be seen in the sequel, that the Apollinarian heresy was very imperfectly known in the Western Church. Eutychianism, on the contrary, was better comprehended than any other heresy, by reason of the active part taken in the controversy by pope Leo I. Therefore, inferences from unsound doctrine, that might have been overlooked by a Latin writer in the Apollinarian age, could scarcely have escaped notice in the Eutychian.

The next particular instanced by the Council of Chalcedon is another, in which Apollinaris and Eutyches alike erred, in imagining a mixture or confusion of the two natures in Christ³. It is evident that this notion is condemned in the words of the Creed, ‘Unus autem, non conversione Divinitatis in carnem, sed assumptione Humanitatis in Deum, unus omnino, non confusione Substantiæ, sed unitate Personæ.’ Both heretics imagined a confu-

¹ Οἱ δὲ σύγχυσιν καὶ κρᾶσιν εἰσάγοντες, καὶ μίαν εἶναι φύσιν τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῆς Θεότητος ἀνόητως ἀναπλάττοντες, καὶ παθητὴν τοῦ Μονογενοῦς τὴν θεῶν φύσιν τῇ συγχύσει τερατευόμενοι. *Def. Fid. Conc. Cath. Vind. Cath.* III. 40.

² The patristical proof of this may be found in the *Vind. Cath.* I. 274; III. 325, 328.

³ Τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν δύο φύσεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ κρᾶσιν, ἢ σύγχυσιν ἐπινοοῦσιν ἀνθίσταται. *Def. Fid. Conc. Chalc.*

sion of substance; the earlier, by declaring the body of Christ to be uncreate and essentially divine, even before the Theophania; the latter, by asserting that, after the birth of Jesus, the substance of the Divine Word was, in such a manner, made one with the human body of Christ, as to form of two but one substance. The later was manifestly a modification of the earlier heresy. Hence it might be impossible to judge from any single clause in the Creed, taken in isolation from the rest, whether the one or the other heretical notion were indicated by the writer. The writers of the fourth, and early part of the fifth, centuries, condemned the Apollinarian heresy in terms, that might also serve for a confutation of the similar distinctive tenet of Eutychianism. If therefore we are convinced, that the other parts of the Athanasian Creed refer to Apollinaris, rather than to his successor, we shall also be justified in referring the clauses, already quoted, to the earlier rather than to the later heresy.

Internal
evidence of
date.

But there is one very broad and marked distinction to be observed, between the two heresiarchs here set in juxtaposition; that the earlier never spoke of a time, when the Divine and Bodily Natures of Christ were separate; whereas the latter expressly taught, that, before the union of the two, they both existed singly and separately. Of this notion we perceive no trace in the Creed. It says indeed, that Christ is 'God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and Man of the substance of His Mother, born in the

Internal
evidence of
date.

world;' but the terms bear upon the Apollinarian notion, that our Lord's body was uncreate and heavenly, and, equally with the Godhead of Christ, begotten before the worlds. It is no confutation of the Eutychian tenets, for so far they coincided with the Catholic faith, as to allow, that the Word was begotten of the Father before the worlds, and that the Human Nature of Christ was born of the Virgin in the world; but it was then superadded, that the one nature was intermingled and made one with the other, although before they had existed in perfectly distinct duality; and of such a notion as this the Creed takes no notice.

As a further proof that the earlier heresy is here indicated, it is said in the succeeding verse, that Christ is 'Perfect God and Perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.' It was the Apollinarian, and not the Eutychian heresy, that imagined, with some of the primitive Gnostics, that the Logos exercised in Christ the functions of a human soul; and such is manifestly the error, in refutation of which it is asserted, that, whether as God or as Man, Christ was in the complete physical and intellectual constitution of the one, and in all the awful and inscrutable attributes of the other nature, wholly and essentially perfect. Comparing therefore with the Creed, the following sentence in the Chalcedonian Council's definition of Faith, we find no assertion to the effect that they are to be anathematised, 'who utter such a fiction, as that our Lord had two natures before their adunation, but subsequently only one;' and this comparison of the docu-

ment formally put forth by the council, with the no less formal statements of the Athanasian Creed, leads us to the inevitable conclusion, that the formulary kept steadily in view Apollinarian, but wholly ignored Eutychian heretical opinions; that is, that it was written after the outbreak of the first, but previously to the dissemination of the latter class of error. It must have been composed therefore before the year 450.

Internal
evidence of
date.

But there is another cardinal point in the history of the Church in this same century, that may enable us to contract the date of this Creed within still closer limits. The Ephesine Council in condemnation of Nestorius, was held A.D. 431; he denied the uterine conjunction of the Godhead and the Manhood, expressed by the orthodox term *θεοτόκος*, and taught that there were two Persons as well as two Natures in Christ. Hence the word *θεοτόκος*, after the meeting of the Synod, became as close a symbol of the orthodox party, headed by Cyril of Alexandria, as ever the reception or rejection of the word *ὁμοούσιος* had been the test of orthodoxy or Arianism in the preceding century. If therefore the Creed had been composed after the year 431, this term would as certainly have found its way into it, as that the corresponding expression had taken a prominent position in the Nicene formulary. We may, for this reason, safely assign to this Creed a date higher than the meeting of this third general council. And it may have been composed several years before the Synod assembled; for although the term was used a full

Internal
evidence of
date.

century before by ¹Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, and at various periods throughout the century by other ecclesiastical writers²; still it only became the ground, upon which a fixed and definite stand was made, after the truth that it expressed had been publicly impugned by Nestorius.

The phrase then having become familiar to Catholic ears before the outbreak of Apollinarianism, it was not excluded from the Creed on account of its novelty or strangeness. Afterwards, when the Council of Ephesus formally asserted the necessity for believing that Christ was born into the world, both God and man, divines universally adopted the term *θεοτόκος*, and continued to maintain it as an additional safeguard against heresy. The absence therefore, of so critical a term, is quite a sufficient proof, that this exposition was composed before the day of Nestorius. For although the assertion that the Person of Christ is one, by taking the Manhood into God, would involve a necessity for the birth into the world of that one individual person, as God and Man, and therefore justify the application of the term *θεοτόκος* to the Blessed Virgin; still the inference is not of that direct and pointed character that is always to be observed, where the terms of a Creed are brought to bear upon an existent heresy. And, notwithstanding this clause, we may safely say, that for all that

¹ Ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, σῶμα φερέσας ἀληθῶς καὶ οὐ δοκῇσει ἐκ τῆς θεοτόκου Μαρίας. Theod. *H. E.* i. 3. Comp. Julian. *Cyr. Al.* viii. 262, 276.

² e.g. Greg. Naz. *ad Cledon.*

Ep. i.: εἴ τις οὐ θεοτόκον τὴν Μαρίαν ὑπολαμβάνει, χωρὶς ἐστὶ τῆς θεότητος. So Athanasius applies the term *θεοτόκος* to the Virgin. *Vind. Cath.* i. 156, 157.

appears in the Creed, the writer was not cognisant of the distinctive tenets of Nestorianism¹.

Water-
land's date
examined.

Up to this point we have been able to follow closely in the steps of Waterland. But a question will now arise, whether in limiting the period within which the Creed could have been composed, to the years included between 420 and 430 A.D., that accomplished theologian has not taken a lower date, than facts would justify. The reason assigned by him, for considering the earlier date to be the highest assignable period, was the strong persuasion that he felt, that the writer of the Creed must have been conversant with writings of Augustine, that could not have been generally known before the year 420. This persuasion was grounded upon two considerations; the expression of Divine Unity of Attribute in the three several persons of the Trinity by a singular adjective, as 'Unus æternus,' &c.; and the statement, that the Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son by procession. With respect to the first of these two positions, the

¹ Waterland thus sums up his argument, shewing that the Athanasian Creed was not composed after 430 A.D. 'There is nothing in the Athanasian Creed but what might have been said, and had been said by Catholic writers before the time of Nestorius. But the creed wants many of those particular and critical expressions, which came into use after that time. Therefore since the internal characters of the Creed suit exactly with the Apollinarian times, and not with the Nestorian, it ought to be placed somewhere

between Apollinaris and Nestorius, not lower than 430 or 431 at the utmost. And it is some confirmation of what hath been said, that Venantius Fortunatus, who lived in the Eutychian times, and commented upon this Creed about the year 570, yet, in his comment, takes not the least notice of any part of this Creed being opposed to the errors of Nestorius or Eutyches, but only to those elder heresies of Sabellius, Arius, and Apollinarius, whom he specially makes mention of.' *Crit. Hist.* 7.

Water-
land's date
examined.

very same page exhibits a quotation made by the author from the writings of Ambrose, altogether similar in verbal peculiarity to the context of the Creed; ‘Ergo Sanctus Pater, Sanctus Filius, Sanctus et Spiritus Sanctus, sed non tres Sancti, quia unus est Deus Sanctus, Unus est Dominus. Una est etenim vera Sanctitas, sicut una est vera Divinitas, una illa vera Sanctitas naturalis.’ Now the reader will scarcely fail to observe the importance of this quotation; for the writer of the Creed, if a member of the Gallican Church, would be just as likely, to say the least, to model his phrases upon an Ambrosian as upon an Augustinian type; and upon the origin of those phrases must depend our chronology. There has always been a tendency among theologians, for the sake of precision, to take up and perpetuate any peculiar expression, exhibiting some phase of truth in a new and remarkable way, the peculiarity of which makes it the more striking to the mind; and we can scarcely imagine, that the words of so eminent a Bishop, as Ambrose of Milan, would remain dormant for so long a period, as the greater part of half a century, without any attempt at imitative amplification. And in fact, he was very soon copied by Faustinus; for the quotation, next adduced from him by Waterland, bears evident marks, that the writer was only following, where Ambrose had led the way; ‘Sed ne duos omnipotentes intelligas præcavendum est; licet enim et Pater sit Omnipotens, et Filius, tamen unus est omnipotens, sicut et unus est Deus; quia Patris et Filii eadem omnipotentia est, sicut et eadem

Deitas¹; Ambrose having previously written, ‘Ergo et Patris et Filii omnipotentia; sed tamen Deus unus omnipotens; quia unitas potestatis est.’

Water-
land's date
examined.

Augustine certainly in his books *De Trinitate*, repeatedly exhibits this same peculiarity of expression; but there is no proof, that this mode of uttering theological truth was unknown between the date, when Ambrose wrote his work on the Holy Spirit, A.D. 381, and the time assigned to the completion of Augustine's books on the Trinity, in 416; rather it would seem, from this latter author's words, that he was closely copying the terms of his predecessors; for he says in opening his subject in the first book; ‘²All the Catholic authors of divine books, whether ancient or recent, whose works I have been able to read, and who have preceded me in writing upon the Trinity, which is God, have aimed at teaching from holy Scripture, that the idea of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, of one and the same substance, involves, by their inseparable equality, the Divine Unity; and therefore, that they are not three Gods, but one God... This is also my faith, since it is the Catholic faith. But as regards this faith, some there are who cannot hear without being moved, that the Father is God, the Son is

¹ Faust. *de Trin.* 3. Ambros. *de Fid.* II. 36.

² ‘Omnes quos legere potui, qui ante me scripserunt de Trinitate, quæ Deus est, divinorum librorum veterum et novorum catholici tractatores, hoc intenderunt secundum scripturas docere, quod Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus unius ejusdemque substantiæ inseparabili æ-

qualitate divinam insinuent unitatem; ideoque non sint tres Dii, sed unus Deus..... Hæc et mea fides est, quando hæc est catholica fides. Sed in ea nonnulli perturbantur, cum audiunt Deum Patrem, et Deum Filium, et Deum Spiritum Sanctum, et tamen hanc Trinitatem, non tres Deos, sed unum Deum.’ Aug. *de Trin.* I. 7, 8.

Water-
land's date
examined.

God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet that this Trinity is not three Gods, but one God.' Phrases implying, on the one hand, that the terms adduced were of established use, and on the other, that the writer was desirous only of defending known ways of expressing the truth against heresy. Thus Tertullian and Ambrose are quite as likely to have suggested various expressions in the Athanasian Creed, as Augustine. The sequel perhaps will shew that they did.

The question therefore is this; does the Creed present a compendious view of the doctrine of Augustine, or does the Father raise the superstructure of his arguments upon the basis already laid in the Creed? Critical reasons, on the whole, may induce us to believe that the latter of these two alternatives expresses the truth. First, however, it will be proper to shew some of the more striking points of similarity, and then to add such critical reasons, as would seem to establish priority in point of time to the Creed. The following words then are altogether similar in substance to corresponding expressions in the Creed.

'¹There is such a power of identity in the sub-

¹ '.....Tantam vim esse ejusdem substantiæ in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto, ut quicquid de singulis ad seipsos dicitur, non pluraliter in summa sed singulariter accipiatur. Quemadmodum enim Pater Deus est, et Filius Deus est, et Spiritus Sanctus Deus est, quod secundum substantiam dici nemo dubitat; non tamen tres Deos, sed unum Deum dicimus eam ipsam præstantissimam

Trinitatem. Ita magnus Pater, magnus Filius, magnus Spiritus Sanctus non tamen tres magni, sed unus magnus. Non enim de Patre solo, sicut illi perverse sentiunt; sed de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, Tu es Deus solus magnus. Et bonus Pater, bonus Filius, bonus Spiritus Sanctus; nec tres boni sed unus est bonus; de quo dictum est, Nemo bonus nisi unus

stance of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, that whatever is said of each singly in themselves, must be understood, not in collective plurality, but singly. For as the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, which nobody doubts to be affirmed of the Divine Substance, still we do not declare that most Glorious Trinity to be three Gods, but one God. In the same way, the Father is Great, the Son is Great, and the Holy Ghost is Great, yet they be not three Great, but one Great. For it is not of the Father alone, as they perversely say, but of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, that it is written, "Thou alone, O God, art Great." The Father again is Good, the Son is Good, and the Holy Ghost is Good; but they be not three Good, but one Good, of whom it is said, "None is Good but God only."...The Father therefore is Almighty, the Son is Almighty, the Holy Ghost is Almighty; and yet they be not three Almighties, but one Almighty, of whom, and through whom, and in whom, are all things, to Him be glory. Whatever therefore God is said to be in Himself, is also said separately of each person, that is, of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and at the same time of the very Trinity, not plurally but singly.' In the same way he says elsewhere, 'That which the three per-

Augustine
compared.

Deus.....Itaque Omnipotens Pater, Omnipotens Filius, Omnipotens Spiritus Sanctus; nec tamen tres Omnipotentes, sed unus Omnipotens, ex quo omnia, per quem omnia, in quo omnia, ipsi gloria. Quidquid ergo ad seipsum dicitur Deus, et de singulis personis singulariter

dicitur, id est de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto, et simul de ipsa Trinitate, non pluraliter, sed singulariter dicitur.' Aug. *de Trin.* v. 9.

¹ 'Quod vero ad se dicuntur singuli, non dici pluraliter tres, sed unam ipsam Trinitatem; sicut Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus Spiritus

Augustine
compared.

sons of the Trinity are said to be in themselves, means not a triple plurality, but one and the very Trinity; as the Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost is God; and the Father is good, the Son is good, the Holy Ghost is good; and the Father is Almighty, the Son is Almighty, the Holy Ghost is Almighty; and yet there are not three Gods, or three Good, or three Almighties; but one Good, Almighty God, the very Trinity.'

Now it is scarcely possible to conceive, that the coincidence between these passages, and the terms of the Creed, can be accidental; and several other passages of a similar nature might be added from this work of Augustine. Either therefore, the Creed was framed from Augustine's work, or the Father was writing in vindication of some such statements of doctrine, as those that are indicated in the Creed. Waterland, of course, in assigning the year A.D. 430 as the probable date of the Creed, advocates the former hypothesis. The more ample development of the symbolical phrases in the work on the Trinity, together with the words of Augustine, declaring that the work was taken in hand in defence of terms that had been controverted, give colour rather to the latter supposition. Catholic writers had occasion to vindicate themselves from a charge of dividing the substance of the Trinity, by shewing that the object of their faith was 'not three Gods, but one God.' Here

p. 561, n. 2.

Sanctus; et bonus Pater, bonus Filius, bonus Spiritus Sanctus; et Omnipotens Pater, Omnipotens Filius, Omnipotens Spiritus Sanc-

tus; nec tamen tres Dii, aut tres boni, aut tres Omnipotentes; sed unus Deus, bonus, Omnipotens, ipsa Trinitas.' *Ibid.* VIII. 1.

then one clause of the Creed, itself the germ and normal type of several of the others, confessedly preceded the work of Augustine. So again, there is a close similarity between the following passage and the statement in the Creed; of which perhaps it is the development: ‘¹For there is not common to the three the idea conveyed by the term Father, that they should reciprocally bear the relation of Father to each other. Nor are there three Sons, since, in the Trinity, the Father is neither Son, nor Holy Spirit. Neither are there three Holy Ghosts, because the Holy Ghost, in that peculiar designation whereby he is called the gift of God, is neither Father nor Son.’ Augustine indeed avows that he was indebted to a considerable extent to the labours of writers who had preceded him; for that, however these doctrines might have been treated by Greek writers, they had never yet been adequately handled in Latin²; terms that are quite consistent with the supposition that this very Creed was in his memory as he wrote. It may be considered then to be at least doubtful, whether the Athanasian Creed may not

Augustine
compared.

¹ ‘Non enim commune illis est id quod Pater est, ut invicem sibi sint Patres.....Nec tres Filii, cum Pater ibi non sit Filius, nec Spiritus Sanctus. Nec tres Spiritus Sancti, quia et Spiritus Sanctus propria significatione, qua etiam donum Dei dicitur, nec Pater nec Filius.’ Aug. *de Trin.* vii. 7.

² ‘Quod si ea quæ legimus de his rebus sufficienter edita in Latino sermone aut non sunt, aut non inveniuntur, aut certe difficile a nobis

inveniri queunt; græcæ autem linguæ non sit nobis tantus habitus, ut talium rerum libris legendis et intelligendis ullo modo reperiamur idonei...Ex his igitur, quæ ab aliis de hac re scripta jam legimus, plurimum adminiculati et adjuti, ea quæ de Trinitate, uno summo summeque bono Deo, pie quæri et disseri posse arbitror, ipso exhortante quærenda atque adjuvante disserenda suscepi.’ Aug. *de Trin.* iii. 1.

Augustine
compared.

be referred to an earlier date, by twenty or thirty years, than that, which Waterland has assigned to it; whether it was not gradually naturalised in the Catholic Church of the West; and whether it was not in consequence of Arian cavils thence arising, that St Augustine wrote his work *de Trinitate*.

Again, it should not be forgotten, that although designated a Creed, this relic of antiquity is rather, as it was indeed anciently entitled, an Exposition of the Catholic Faith; setting forth the fuller meaning of certain theological terms contained in all other Creeds, and illustrating them with wonderful acuteness and precision. In the true sense of the term Creed, as a Symbol defined and promulgated by the Church, it was in its first origin no Creed at all; however it may have been raised to that position in after time, on account of its intrinsic excellence. The reasoning of Waterland, therefore, loses its cogency, when he observes; ‘If it be said, that St Austin might as well copy from the Creed, as the Creed from him; I say, No, for the reason is different. Creeds, and other the like formularies, which are to be put into every one’s hands, and spread round about, ought not to contain any thing, till it has been maturely weighed, long considered, and fully explained as well as proved, and generally acknowledged by the Churches of Christ. It is therefore much more reasonable to believe that St Austin’s writings should go first, and a general approbation of them in that particular; and then the Creed might conveniently follow, the way being now opened for it.’

c. 7, but cf.
c. 8.

Another reason urged by Waterland in support of his opinion, that the Creed was framed from St Augustine's writings, was the statement contained in it, that the Holy Ghost is 'a Patre et Filio; non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus est, sed procedens.' The modern Greeks, he says, look upon Augustine as the inventor of this doctrine; but incorrectly, however certain it may be 'that his elaborate arguments, and solid proofs from Scripture of the truth, and of the importance of the doctrine, made it pass the more readily, and gave it credit and authority enough to have a place in a standing Creed, or Confession; which is to me another argument of the Creed's being made after St Austin's writings were well known in the world.' Now if the Creed had stated in as round terms as Augustine, that the Holy Spirit proceeds directly from both Father and Son, there might be a considerable degree of weight in such a fact; especially if it could be shewn, that no earlier writer had expressed himself in a similar manner. But the Creed does not express itself in this way. It declares its doctrine in a manner, that might cause slight demurring, but would not be condemned by the Greek Church of almost any age, stating that the Holy Spirit is, 'a Patre et Filio,' and that the mode of his subsistence is neither by being made nor created, nor begotten, but by procession. For all that appears on the face of the Creed, the writer could have symbolised with Basil, or Gregory, or any other Greek writer, in

Augustine
compared.

See Comm.
on v. 22.

Augustine
compared.

affirming the Holy Spirit to proceed¹ from the Father by the Son. He would still be from the Father and the Son, although originally from the one, and mediately by the other; and his hypostatic relation in the Trinity would be by procession. Compare then with this more equivocal expression of a truth, that was soon to be brought out in distinct prominence, the far more decided terms of Augustine²: 'Neither can we say that the Holy Ghost doth not proceed also from the Son; for it is not inconsiderately, that the same Spirit is declared to be the Spirit of the Father and the Son.' Christ also breathing upon his Apostles, is said to have afforded a demonstration, that 'the Holy Ghost proceeds, not only from the Father, but also from the Son.' Again³, 'Let him understand that like as the Father hath of Himself, that the Holy Spirit should proceed from Him; so hath he given to the Son, that the same Holy Spirit should proceed from Him, and in either case without interval of time.....The Spirit is not begotten of both, but he proceeds from both of them.' The concluding

¹ The meaning of this Greek theological formula is thus declared by Athanasius: τὸ δὲ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐκπόρευμα ὃν τοῦ Πατρὸς, δὲ ἐστὶν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ τοῦ πέμποντος Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ φέροντος Υἱοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐπλήρωσε τὰ πάντα. Athan. *Exp. Symb.* Vind. *Cath.* i. 552. cf. i. 13. Greg. Naz.

² 'Nec possumus dicere quod Spiritus Sanctus et a Filio non procedat, neque enim frustra idem Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur. Nec video quid aliud significare voluerit, cum sufflans in fa-

ciem discipulorum ait, Accipite Spiritum Sanctum...Demonstratio per congruam significationem, non tantum a Patre, sed et a Filio procedere Spiritum Sanctum.' Aug. *de Trin.* iv. 29.

³ Intellegat sicut habet Pater in semet ipso, ut de illo procedat Spiritus Sanctus, sic dedisse Filio, ut de illo procedat idem Spiritus Sanctus, et utrumque sine tempore..... Non igitur ab utroque est genitus, sed procedit ab utroque amborum Spiritus.' *Ibid.* xv. 47.

chapters of the work on the Trinity exhibit so many pointed statements of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, as well as from the Father, as to render it unnecessary to do more than refer the reader to that work. In this point of view again then, it would seem that the statement of the Creed is of the more rudimental, and therefore earlier, character; and that it was worked up into a shape of more definite consistency by Augustine.

Augustine
compared.

Further, in the Creed we find the analogical illustration, that 'as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ.' The complex person man, formed of two substances, Spirit and matter, is, *à priori*, just as inexplicable, as that God, by two natures combining in one person, should have been made man. The illustration is apt and convincing. But by a far more artificial and subtle development of a similar idea, Augustine illustrates the reality of a Trinity in Unity by the constitution of man, as an intellectual being, and follows out the train of thought through six books, that may clash with our views of the philosophy of the human mind, but are by no means devoid of interest.

So he sees a similitude to the great mystery of our Faith in the mind and consciousness, and in self-love proceeding from both. The three relative properties, as he argues, are co-ordinate, their substance one¹. The same again is traced in the

Lib. ix.

¹ St Augustine, even in working out this illustration, cannot avoid falling into modes of thought that are so characteristic of the Creed:

Recapitu-
lation.

x. xi.

mind, subsisting in a state of memory, intelligence and volition. Also in mind acted upon by matter; as in the phenomena of vision. Both the Creed and the venerable writer argue from man's bodily and mental constitution, in illustration of the highest objects of our faith; but the convincing simplicity of the Creed, and the strained and artificial reasoning of the father, satisfy the judgment, that if the idea struck out by the one was caught up by the other, the Creed, and not the writer, exhibits the archetype.

The reasons therefore that induced Waterland to limit the date of the Creed, in an ascending chronological series, to the year 420, may not be equally satisfactory to every mind. Such peculiarly turned phrases as *tres æterni* were not unknown forty years before; therefore they may have found their way to the writer of the Creed through other channels than Augustine. In making use of these terms, also, the venerable father expresses himself as defending theological expressions assailed by heretical opponents, rather than as inventing phrases new to Catholic ears.

Again, the title whereby this symbolical definition was so generally known to antiquity, as an 'Exposition of the Catholic Faith,' and which so wholly agrees with its internal character, marks that it is rather an amplification of certain symbolical statements, than a compilation from such a

'Hæc igitur tria, memoria, intelligentia, voluntas, quoniam non sunt tres vitæ, sed una vita; nec tres

mentes, sed una mens; consequenter utique, nec tres substantiæ sunt, sed una substantia.' *De Trin.* x. 18.

work as that of Augustine, *De Trinitate*. The procession of the Holy Ghost, also, from the Son as well as from the Father, would have been brought out more sharp and clear in the Creed, had its words been framed from the very definite statements of Augustine, that were the result of Scriptural reasonings collected into one focus of light; and we should have found the Creed expressing itself in some such other way, as, ‘non factus, neque creatus, neque genitus, sed ab utroque procedens.’ And finally we may take into our account, quantulumcunque valeat, the elaborate illustration of the Trinity, from the intellectual and sensible constitution of man, as followed out by Augustine, apparently from the original germ of thought suggested by the Creed, where it illustrates the junction of two natures in one Christ, by the union of the two substances of mind and matter in man. The coincidence, as far as it holds good, would not have been so remarkable, were it not for the almost demonstrable certainty, from other points of resemblance, that either Augustine was cognisant of the Creed, or that the Creed was compiled from Augustine. For these reasons therefore, we may venture to refer the origin of the Creed to a yet higher date, than that assigned to it by Waterland; and what that date may be, we proceed to enquire.

Now, whenever the Creed was composed, either the Apollinarian heresy must have been at its height, or the writer must have composed it in vindication of his faith, under a charge of Apollinarianism. So close and careful an exposition

The Creed
not put
forth

would hardly have been put forth without some such urgent reason. With regard to the first supposition, there was no heresy that, externally, had so ephemeral a character as the Apollinarian. At Rome it was known only by hearsay. The position of the heresiarch, as bishop of a see in the Patriarchate of Antioch, his excellent private character, and his intimate relations with the leading men of the time, Jerome, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzum, &c., caused that public exposure of his errors to be delayed, which has always been found to favour, rather than check the rapid dissemination of heresy, where a temperate spirit and moderate councils have not prevailed. Hence it was not until the council of Rome under Damasus, that the unsound Bishop was pointedly named and publicly condemned. But even then, a more private reason than the active diffusion of this heresy, will enable us to account for the exposure of Apollinaris. Peter the Alexandrian patriarch having been driven from his see by the Arian party, had been replaced by Timotheus, a disciple of Apollinaris. Peter, therefore, who sought an asylum at Rome, would naturally urge on the condemnation of Apollinaris, both on public grounds, and as a considerable step in the direction of his own restoration. Certainly, the presence of the deposed patriarch must qualify the notion of the spread of Apollinarianism in Italy, inferred by the condemnation of the heresiarch. The words of Damasus, as recorded by Theodoret in the synodical epistle of another council held at Rome in 378,

A.D.
375.

shew that both Apollinaris and Timotheus had been condemned at the previous council. ¹Τί τοίνυν πάλιν παρ' ἐμοῦ ζητεῖτε τὴν καθαίρεσιν Τιμοθέου; ὃς καὶ ἐνταῦθα κρίσει τῆς ἀποστολικῆς καθέδρας, παρόντος καὶ Πέτρου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων πόλεως, καθηρέθη ἅμα τῷ διδασκάλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἀπολλίναρίῳ. But even after this formal act of condemnation, it would seem that the heresy was known only to a very limited extent, in the Western Church; because after a lapse of six years, Ambrose and his brother Italian bishops, in their first letter² to Theodosius, speak of the freedom of Italy from heresy; but that Apollinarianism threatened it from the East, and that all synodical precaution had been used to meet it; at the same time, however, they shew in the terms they use, that they knew little about the matter themselves. Two years after this date Damasus had occasion to write to Paulinus, the Eustathian Bishop of Antioch; and as his local connexion would necessarily bring him into contact with Apollinaris, we cannot be surprised, that, as his patron, he should have cautioned him against his suffragan of Laodicea, though he refrains from naming him. This letter therefore contains no proof that Apollinarianism was at all more widely known in Italy than it was eight years before. The penal laws of Theodosius against heretics, the

to meet the
growth of
heresy.

A.D.
381.

A.D.
383.

¹ Theodoret. *H. E.* v. 10.

² 'Non pro Italia, quæ jamdudum ab Arianis quæta atque securæ est, nec ulla hæreticorum perturbatione vexatur...sed ut ea, quæ communionem nostram de orientis parte turbaverunt, cognoscerentur

in synodo...Non solum enim de his quæ clementia tua dignata est scribere, sed etiam de illis, qui dogma nescio quod, quod Apollinaris asseritur, in ecclesias conantur inducere, nos pleraque moverunt.' Labbe and Cossart. *Conc.* A.D. 381.

The Creed
not put
forth

Apollinarians being among the number, were issued first in the same year, and confirmed by re-enactment in 388, whereby the Italian Church at least was kept free from this dangerous heresy. Accordingly, nothing more is heard of it south of the Alps.

Similarly as regards the Gallican branch of the Western Church, St Jerome, writing against Vigilantius¹, A.D. 406, speaks of it as having been remarkably free from heresy up to that time; ‘Sola Gallia monstra non habuit, sed viris semper fortibus, et eloquentissimis abundavit.’ Immediately after this date the irruption of barbarous hordes produced other and fresh causes for anxiety. It is at such seasons that faith is purified from dross; and however the heresy may have had an occasional existence, in isolated cases, it certainly never reared its head in public; so as to demand the preparation of such stringent and carefully poised statements, as we find in the Athanasian Creed. When these clouds cleared away, the tendency of half-informed minds in Gaul was to Pelagianism, rather than to Apollinarianism; and any public doctrinal formula would have been much more likely to turn on the doctrines of Original Sin and Grace, than upon the Incarnation. Thus Hilary, to whom Waterland assigns the authorship of this Creed, was no sooner enthroned at the age of twenty-eight² in the see of Arles, than Pelagianism on the one hand, and the novel views of Augustine about Predestination on the other, gave

¹ Hieronym. *contra Vigil.* 1.

² A.D. 429. Hilary died at the age of 48, A.D. 449.

him matter for much anxious thought. An exposition of the Doctrine of the Incarnation would hardly have been the most suited to times such as these.

to meet the
growth of
heresy.

Apollinarianism does not appear to have been at all better known in the African Church; for Augustine, writing in the beginning of the fifth century, speaks of it as a bygone evil, 'Noverit Sanctitas Vestra, fuisse quamdam hæresim, vel adhuc fortassis haberi reliquias quorundam, qui dicti sunt Apollinaristæ.' We may safely conclude then, that if the Creed was first composed in Latin, no irruption of heresy, in any branch of the Latin Church, will account for its origin. It is needless to go over the arguments, whereby Waterland has traced it home to the Gallican Church, by the application of the soundest critical principles. Briefly, the several circumstances that point to this conclusion are the following: 1. It was first received, so far as appears, in the Gallican Church. 2. Gallican councils and bishops have always paid especial regard to it. 3. It was admitted as an appendage to the Psalter, by those churches that received their Psalter from Gaul. 4. The oldest version, of which we hear, is the Gallican version of Hincmar. 5. The first writers that mention it are Gallican. 6. The first, that quote the words of the Creed, are the writers Avitus of Vienne, and Cæsarius of Arles. 7. The oldest commentator, though an Italian, was Bishop of Poitiers. 8. And lastly, manuscript copies of the Creed were nowhere so abundant, or so ancient, as in Gaul. Referring therefore the origin of the Creed to the Gallican

Enarr. in
Psal. xxix.
§ 2.

Leporius. Church, but the words to the writings of Augustine, Waterland next proposes to shew how, and at what date, any close intercourse took place between the Gallican Church, and the Bishop of Hippo. He selects the year, in which Leporius, having been driven out of the Gallican Church, on account of his advocacy of Pelagian and Apollinarian error, passed over to Carthage, and after a period of instruction by Aurelius and Augustine, recanted his errors, and returned. Yet feelings of regard may have brought him back to Augustine; and this refugee may be the Leporius¹, whom he mentions as a presbyter, a foreigner by extraction, of good birth, and who had disposed of his patrimony before he came to Hippo. If this is the case, the naturalisation of Leporius in the African Church, could not account for the reception of the works of Augustine in Gaul; although the converse might be true; and if other considerations agreed, the exposition of the Catholic Faith might, very possibly, have been first introduced to Augustine's notice by his Gallican convert from heresy. But the whole area of Latin divinity was so familiar to Augustine, and he was so repeatedly consulted upon various points by the Churches of Italy and the West, that it is very improbable, that a remarkable production, like the Athanasian Creed, should have existed for any length of time, in any branch of the Latin Church, without his knowledge.

¹ 'Vestrum plurimi sciunt, presbyterum Leporium, quamvis sæculi natalibus clarum, et apud suos honestissimo loco natum, tamen jam

Deo servientem cunctis quæ habebat relictis inopem suscepi.' Aug. *Serm. De Divers.* 356. § 10.

It should be observed, likewise, that the date of the disgrace and recovery of Leporius is marked by no historical note of time. The learned have assigned to it various dates, ranging between 410 and 427¹ A.D., giving a latitude of seventeen years.

The Creed
Apologetic.

On the whole, therefore, it would seem, that the Latin churches were at no time infected with Apollinarianism; certainly not in a sufficient degree to account for the publication of this vigorous exposition of the Catholic Faith, in refutation of it. We fall back therefore on the second supposition, and propose to enquire, whether it may not have been written by some eminent member of the Church, in vindication of the purity of his faith from a charge of Apollinarianism. Now there is a degree of force and apologetic earnestness about the whole production, that rather indicate some such origin as this. It is hardly in keeping with the mild 'Credo' of a newly-installed prelate. In the year 401 A.D., we can point out the case of a most popular and zealous bishop of Western Gaul, apostolical in his labours among the benighted people of the Morini and Nervii², as well as in his self-inflicted poverty³; who was accused publicly

¹ e.g. Card. Noris, A.D. 410. Baronius, A.D. 420. Garnier, A.D. 424. Sirmond, A.D. 425. Montfaucon and Harduin, A.D. 426. Pagi, A.D. 427.

² i.e. the seaboard of the Pas de Calais, and Belgium. 'Ita et nunc in terra Morinorum situ orbis extrema, quam barbaris fluctibus tundit Oceanus, gentium populi remotarum...orta sibi per tuam sanctita-

tem a Domino luce gaudentes, corda aspera Christo intrante posuerunt... Tu remotissimo Nervici littoris tractu, quem tenui antehac spiritu fides veritatis afflaverat...in te prima effulsit clarius,' &c. Paulin. Nol. *Ep. xviii. ad Victricium*, 4.

³ 'Ut Magister ipse fecit, cujus tu imitator es; qui potestatem habens de Evangelio vivendi, noluit tamen uti potestate sua, et abutens

Victricius, with teaching heresy, and that evidently of Apollinaris; who also gave account of his faith in a confession¹, that, without any great degree of improbability, may be identified with this exposition of the Catholic Faith. This once eminent son of the Church,

licito, hanc occasionem sibi cumulandæ apud Christum mercedis invenit, ut Evangelium sine sumptu poneret. Tua vero Sanctitas non solum de abusione licitorum, et abstinentia commodorum visibilibus Christianæ paupertatis divitem gloriam tenet; sed sicut comperi etiam de multitudine adversantium, et tolerantia tentationum; quoniam 'insurrexerunt in te testes iniqui, et mentita est iniquitas sibi.' Ps. xxvi. 12. Sed nodus in scirpo et nævus in lumine non potuit inveniri... quem inexpugnabili scuto teget veritas Dei, ut arcus eorum infirmetur, qui in te dicuntur acuisse linguarum macheras. Sed 'ut sagittæ parvulorum, ita infirmati sunt ictus eorum;' Ps. lxxiii. 4, 9, nec potuerunt in corpore, armis Dei potentibus septo, locum vulneris invenire; Dominus enim protectio tua, et Dominus illuminatio cordis tui, qui te in spiritu veritatis instruxit, ut in doctrina Pauli magisteriis gentium, cum fide et veritate, non in inflatione scientiæ, neque in sublimitate sermonis annuntias mysterium Christi, sed nihil te judicans scire inter homines, nisi Christum Jesum, et ipsum crucifixum.' Paulin. Nol. *Ep.* xxxvii. ad *Victricium*, § 3, 4.

¹ 'Cum ergo fides et confessio tua, ut credimus atque confidimus, cœternam Trinitatem, unius Divinitatis et substantiæ, et operis et regni esse testetur; cumque Patrem Deum, et Filium Deum, et Spiritum Sanctum Deum, ut est, qui est et erat et venturus est; qui misit te

sicut Moysem et Apostolos evangelizare gentibus bona Domini; quod ita, ut ipse a Deo doctus es, doces, unitatem Trinitatis sine confusione jungens, et Trinitatem ipsius unitatis sine separatione distinguens, ita ut nulla alteri persona conveniat, et in omni persona trium Deus unus eluceat; et tantus quidem Filius, quantus et Pater, quantus et Spiritus Sanctus; sed semper quisque nominis sui proprietate distinctus, individuam retinet in virtutis et gloriæ æqualitate concordiam.

'Certi autem sumus, quod et Filium Dei ita prædicas, ut eundem et Filium Hominis confiteri non erubescas; tam vere Hominem in nostra natura, quam vere Deum in sua; sed Filium Dei ante sæcula, quia ipse est Dei Verbum Deus, qui erat in principio apud Deum, æque Deus coomnipotens et cooperator Patris... Et hoc Verbum, pietatis immensæ mysterio, caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis. Non autem caro tantum corporis nostri, sed homo totus, et corporis nostri et animæ assumptione. Animæ autem rationalis, quæ juxta naturale officium Dei habet insitam mentem; alioquin in tenebris Apollinaris errabimus, si hominem assumptum Deo animam mentis humanæ vacuam, qualis est pecorum et jumentorum, dicamus habuisse; et eum hominem, quem suscepit Dei Filius, necesse est ea veritate, qua veritas est, et qua creavit hominem, totum suscepit, ut opus suum plena salute renovaret.' *Ibid.* 5, 6.

was Victricius, confessor, and Bishop of Rouen, who at the close of the fourth century was considerably advanced in years. There is a letter to him extant, written by Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, expressing his great regret, that Victricius had been unable, on his return from Rome, to proceed homewards by the way of Nola; the letter also contains an account of the writer's faith, with an expression of firm conviction, that it was addressed to one who agreed in the same doctrine, although he had been compelled by false accusation to give an account of his faith. Now the words of Paulinus contain a negation, partly of Arian, but principally of Apollinarian error. It exhibits also several subordinate points of resemblance with the matter of the Creed, as may be seen from the extracts given in the note.

Bishop of
Rouen.

But Paulinus had also written to Victricius five years before, in excuse for having induced Paschasius, a deacon of Rouen, to pass some time at Nola on his return from Rome. This former letter takes cognisance only of the early history of the Confessor, of his apostolical labours among the robbers and pirates of the Belgian coast, and of his zealous administration of the See of Rouen. If any imputation had been cast at that time on the orthodoxy of Victricius, much more if Paschasius had been dispatched, in consequence of such accusation, to Rome, Paulinus could not fail to have taken the same notice of the fact in his first letter, which we find five years later in the second. We may conclude therefore, that this circumstance arose to trouble the venerable Confessor of Rouen,

Anastasius. after the year 399, in which Paulinus wrote first, and before the year 404, when the second letter was written. Pope Anastasius I. died after an incumbency of three years, in the month of April A.D. 402, and was succeeded by Innocent I. But this latter Pope, in the year 404, sent, at the request of Victricius, a *Liber Regularis*, or short code of rules, pertaining to matters of religious discipline, for the regulation of the Churches within reach of Rouen; and the accompanying epistle¹, wholly ignores any imputation of heresy, as attaching to the name of Victricius. It is a fair inference therefore, that the imputation had been made and cleared away, under the incumbency of the former pontiff Anastasius; himself an earnest investigator of heresy, and certain to have called to account any bishop of the Latin Church, against whom the charge of teaching false doctrine had been advanced. If therefore this Creed was composed in answer to such a charge, as the testimony and confession of faith mentioned by Paulinus, and was submitted to Anastasius, we may deduce from this the reason, why its authorship should have been assigned to this bishop, in a Gallican manuscript, written about A.D. 850; because, by a progression of error, natural enough in careless or ignorant scribes, the name of Victricius may have been easily expunged from the title, and the authorship referred to Anastasius; one of greater name, only

¹ The epistle begins, 'Etsi tibi, frater carissime, pro merito et honore sacerdotii, quo plurimum polles, vivendi et docendi ecclesiasticæ

regulæ nota sunt omnia, neque est aliquid, quod de sacris lectionibus tibi minus collectum esse videatur,' &c. Innocent. I. *Ep.* 2.

because he was for three years a Roman Pontiff; and further, even this comparatively obscure name may in process of time, have become changed for one so precious, as that of Athanasius has always been to the Church. The same critical canon, whereby a more difficult reading is often to be considered as preferable to one less obscure, would compel us to say, that the change of the name of Athanasius into that of Anastasius is highly improbable, but that the converse may be nearer to the truth. Since therefore an ancient MS.¹ ascribes the Creed to Anasthasius, and a Commentator entitles it ‘Fides Anastasii Papæ,’ it becomes a question, whether this is not an earlier title, than ‘Fides S. Athanasii.’ Since also no manuscript is found earlier than the eighth century, that assigns the composition to Athanasius, a wide margin of three hundred years is left for the introduction of change in the title. It is remarkable, that the earliest MS.², named no author of the Creed, but simply styled it ‘Fides Catholica;’ as does also Venantius Fortunatus in his commentary.

Athanasius.

Lastly, Waterland deeming it necessary to indicate some period, in which a closer connexion than usual subsisted between Augustine and the Gallican Church, fixed, as we have seen, upon the return of Leporius, a Gallican presbyter, as an event, that might account for a wider circulation of the Father’s works in Gaul, leading, among other results, to the compilation of the Creed.

¹ See Waterland, 3, 4, and note 2, p. 584.

² The Cottonian MS., A. D. 600, now lost.

Candidianus.

But it is fully as probable, that such an event may have first brought the Creed under the notice of the Bishop of Hippo, so early as the year 410; and six or seven years before the Books *De Trinitate* were composed. And a still earlier intercourse between this Church and Augustine, may possibly be traced. For the bearer of the letter of Victricius, answered by the second letter of Paulinus A.D. 404, was one Candidianus, who in all probability was charged to proceed from Nola to Rome with the letter, to which the 'Liber regularis' from Pope Innocent I. in the same year, was the reply. It is remarkable, that in a work of Augustine, the date of which is very uncertain, the uncommon name of Candidianus again appears, as the bearer of a letter from Paulinus to the Bishop of Hippo, who also sent him back again with a reply to the question proposed to him for solution by the Bishop of Nola. Augustine¹ speaks of him indeed as a 'compresbyter;' Paulinus², as 'filii nostri Candidiani,' that is, one not yet of the presbyterate; but if three or four years elapsed between the two missions; if also, as is not at all improbable, Candidianus in the mean time received his ordination at the hands of Paulinus, and became a presbyter of the Church of Nola, the real channel perhaps is now indicated, whereby the Creed was first made known to Augustine. For, if it was composed A.D. 401, Candidianus would bear the words in his memory, when sent to Nola in 404; and he would hardly fail to impart a know-

¹ Aug. *De cura gerenda pro mortuis*, sub fine.

² Paul. *Ep.* XXXVII. 1.

ledge of them to Augustine, when he reached Hippo at a later date. Recapitulation.

For four several reasons therefore, it is quite as probable that the authorship of the Creed may be assigned to Victricius, as to Hilary. 1. Its careful, well-considered terms, are more consistent with the mature age of the former, who had attained the honour of Confessor forty years before the date now assigned to the Creed in 401, than with the youth of the latter; who was only eight and twenty years of age, when he is supposed by Waterland to have composed this Creed, on his advancement to the episcopate. 2. Its style, though not that of an apology in vindication of the writer's faith, agrees well with the supposition, that he was accused of the errors that he anathematises. 3. Its matter is exactly parallel with the subjects, upon which Victricius, if we may judge from the expressions of Paulinus, was called to defend himself. With respect to both of these last particulars, the supposition that Hilary should have been the author, is singularly unsatisfactory to the judgment. His exposition of faith, on entering upon his episcopal office, would scarcely have been pointed with anathemas, that the history of his time persuades us were not required. Indeed the Creed can only be assigned to Hilary upon the supposition, that Apollinarianism infested the Gallican Church at the date of his appointment to the See of Arles; a supposition wholly contrary to fact. But since we know, that Pelagian tenets had then taken a firm root in the south of France, we know also the di-

Author of
the Creed,
and date.

rection that any inaugural exposition by Hilary must have taken. 4. Again, if Hilary had been the author of the Creed, his name must have commanded respect, and he would scarcely have met with such hard words from Pope Leo I., as may be found in the epistle to the French bishops, A.D. 445¹. On the other hand, the highly probable communication between Victricius and Anastasius, and the preparation of a confession of faith by the Gallican Confessor, indicates the process, whereby the name of Athanasius², by assimilation, may have been placed at length at the head of the Creed. For these reasons, therefore, it is considered, that the authorship of the Creed may be referred to the Confessor Victricius, Bishop of Rouen; and that the date of the production may be assigned to the year 401.

¹ 'Hilarius ecclesiarum statum, et concordiam sacerdotum novis præsumptionibus turbaturus exceperit. ... Ubi postquam Hilarius rationabile ... respondere non habuit, ad ea se occulta cordis ipsius transtulerunt, quæ nullus laicorum dicere, nullus sacerdotum posset audire. ... Apparet quam mitis sit corde Hilarius! ... Quid sibi Hilarius quærit in aliena provincia? ... Non est hoc... salubritatem impendere diligentiae pastoralis, sed vim inferre latronis et furis. ... Non ergo Hilarius tam studuit episcopum consecrare, quam eum potius, qui ægrotabat, occidere. ... Nec ultra audeat Hilarius con-

ventus indicere synodales et sacerdotum Domini judicia, se interse-
rendo, turbare... Quod potest forsitan, ad depravandos vestræ sanctitatis animos, Hilarius, pro suo more, mentiri.' Leo, *Ep.* 10.

² Isidore of Seville first assigned the Creed to Athanasius, but the Epistle ad Claudium ducem, is either spurious, or interpolated. His words are, 'Quod in Nicæna vel CPTana synodo, sub anathemate prohibitum legitur in symbolo, *et in illo Sancti Athanasii de fide catholica*, diminuere vel addere aliquid.' The words in italics certainly read like an interpolation.

THE THEOLOGY

OF THE

ATHANASIAN CREED.

1 QUICUNQUE VULT SALVUS ESSE, ANTE OMNIA
OPUS EST, UT TENEAT CATHOLICAM FIDEM. Necessity
of a right
faith.

2 QUAM NISI QUIQUE INTEGRAM INVIOLATAM-
QUE SERVAVERIT, ABSQUE DUBIO IN ÆTERNUM PER-
IBIT.

THE integrity of the saving doctrines contained in the Bible has been carefully guarded, from the beginning, by the most binding injunctions of the written word itself. ‘Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it,’ was the solemn warning of the Mosaic Dispensation. The Gospel no less stringently enforces the necessity of a pure faith, and the necessity is completely practical. For the regeneration of man in the spirit of holiness, and the harmonising of his will to the will of God, is the final cause of all revelation, and the Incarnation of Christ is as the fountain-head of that regeneration. He was born into the world as an universal Saviour. He must be born in the soul to make salvation possible. The Spirit of Christ is that, which must raise up the new man from the dust of the earth. Faith is the necessary mean.

Regenera-
tive virtue

But this Faith involves the practical obedience of the Gospel. Soul and spirit may be justified by faith, but the heart is purified by it. 'This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works.' It was to teach the necessity above all things of a living faith, that our Lord so continually made it the indispensable medium for conveying his blessings. 'Only believe;' 'all things are possible to him that believeth.' 'Thy faith hath made thee whole.' 'He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.....believest thou this?' And elsewhere, 'He could not do many mighty works there because of their unbelief.'

Faith, therefore, that is whole and undefiled, in God the Father of All, and in Christ both God and Man, and in the sanctifying efficacy of God the Holy Ghost, lies closely at the root of our regeneration. A right Faith is as a matter of life and death to the soul; and so it always has been. God was pleased of old to speak of himself as a jealous God, because Infinite Goodness is too jealous of the soul's eternal interests to permit man to place his trust in anything that cannot save; and Christ in his mercy has warned us, that the Faith of the Gospel, and that alone, is our safe guide for eternity; for to that alone is the promise made of justification from sin, and regeneration by the Spirit of Holiness. No terms therefore can be too strong, that are used to keep men in the one straight path of salvation; no

expressions can be accused of harshness, that serve of Faith. to deter them from deviation. The view of men in the world, that the deep things of God, so graciously revealed to us for our everlasting good, are mere matters of opinion, things indifferent, that may be held or rejected at pleasure, finds no place in the Gospel. Things doubtless there are that man has attempted to bind upon man as matters of vital moment, that have had no power to cramp his spirit, when enlightened by the Word; but the fundamentals of faith are of a widely different character; they are seen clearly in proportion as the Word is studied faithfully; and the vital importance assigned to them in Scripture is as plainly marked as that those doctrines themselves are there.

No statement, for instance, can be more definite and precise, than those words of Christ himself, 'Preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.' And again, 'Whosoever shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels.' 'He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.' So true is it, not only, that 'without Faith it is impossible Heb. x'. 6. to please God,' but that the Faith alone, that is worthy of the name, and is accepted of God, is the Faith that is built up on the Holy Incarnation

Necessity and Nativity of Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man. The Apostles, in the same way, assure us of the necessity for a right Faith, and in terms that are equally solemn and startling: 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.' 'If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.' So Hymenæus and Alexander were delivered over to Satan, or separated from the communion of the Church for doctrinal error, 'that they might learn not to blaspheme,' in 'saying that the Resurrection,' faith in which is the basis of man's regeneration, 'was past already.' Therefore, if we listen with reverence to the words of Christ; if we recognise, in the doctrine and practice of his Apostles, the working of the self-same spirit, we cannot do otherwise than accept with confidence the statement, that the Church by long usage has made her own, 'Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith.' 'Whosoever will be saved,' that is, wholly redeemed to God in Christ, and to this end rescued from the guilt and penalty of his sins, and raised in any measure above their power for the future, and not left to languish for ever under the intolerable tyranny of Satan, 'above all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith.'

Acts xvi. 31.

Gal. i. 9.

1 Tim. i. 20.

2 Tim. ii. 18.

Now the Catholic Faith, whatever else it may embrace, is no less than the entire substance of the doctrines contained in the Creeds of the Church, that formed the preaching of the Apostles before the Gospels were written. 'Whosoever is

Christ Jesus, there is the Church Catholic'.¹ First of a pure Faith. it was built upon the words of Christ; then upon the doctrine of the Apostles; and since the Canon of Scripture was completed, the written Word of God contains all saving elements of the Catholic Faith, and must be received, with a sincere and loyal obedience, by all who hope to be saved by its doctrines. Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he receive this Faith, not only as a system of subjective truth, but as an abiding discipline for patient continuance in well-doing. The command was not only to baptize in a right faith, but to instruct in pure practice; and no one, who holds the truth of the Bible, will refuse his assent to the assertion, awful though it be, that except a man do thus hold the Faith as a practical system, resulting from doctrinal purity, without doubt his final salvation is in peril. The Creed has its operative as well as its speculative phase, and both have the savour of life unto life. It is a point of vitally essential doctrine, for instance, that we believe that 'all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works.' Unless a man does heartily believe this, he cannot be saved; while a firm belief in it will produce sure action in the way of wisdom; and faith and practice, by mutual action and reaction, will lead a man on, more and more, to the perfect day. In a more usual and ordinary sense than was intended by Tertullian, it may still be asked,

¹ "Οπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. Ignat. ad Smyrn. viii.

Faith in a
Trinity.

‘Quando Deus magis creditur, nisi cum magis timetur?’ (*De Fuga*, 1.) The converse also is true; and in lapsing progression, the more a man sins against the Gospel, the more hardened he grows in unbelief of its doctrines. The faith then must be kept whole. It must also be kept ‘undefiled;’ raising the soul by a pure belief to close communion with God; and bringing the body into a more full subjection to the law of the Gospel. We conclude, therefore, that to hold the Catholic Faith, is to believe the Word that Christ hath spoken, and to follow where he hath led; and unless we do thus keep the faith, ‘whole and undefiled,’ not wilfully weakening the authority of the least of Christ’s commandments, but in a true catholic sense preserving their spirit entire and inviolate, as truly as Christ hath spoken, so truly shall his Word judge us at the last day.

3 FIDES AUTEM CATHOLICA HÆC EST, UT UNUM DEUM IN TRINITATE, ET TRINITATEM IN UNITATE VENEREMUR¹.

pp. 117—128. The unity of the Godhead has already formed the subject of consideration, when the opening words of the Creed were explained. It remains to be seen that the Three Persons of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, though in personal individuality distinct, are in substance and nature wholly one. The doctrine of the Trinity indeed, as held by the Church Catholic, is the great safeguard for Faith

¹ ‘Unum sunt ergo Filius et Spiritus; unum nomen est Trinitatis, et una inseparabilisque præsentia, Ambros. *de Sp.* S. I. 135.

in the Unity of the Godhead¹. For the end of our faith is the full accomplishment of the Divine counsels, when God shall be ~~an~~ in all; when the Mediatorial Kingdom of Christ shall be complete, 'the Son himself shall be subject unto Him that put all things under him.' The Spirit of adoption also that now marks the child of grace, shall pass into something better, and the unutterable pleadings of the Holy Spirit shall cease, when every danger is at length past, and the unnumbered host of God's elect are saved for ever in Christ, and through him have perfect access by one Spirit unto the Father. The Mediatorial work indeed will then be at an end, and all things shall be summed up together in Christ; but such as the Divine Nature has been from all eternity, such shall it for

The safe-guard of Unity.

1 Cor. xv. 28.

Eph. ii. 18.

Eph. i. 10.

¹ 'Veritas Christiana districte pronuntiavit, Deus si non unus est, non est.' Tertull. *adv. Marc.* i. 3.

'Agnoscens divinitatem, negasti diversitatem.' *Ibid.* 6.

'Quando unitas ex semet ipsa derivans Trinitatem, non destruat ab illa, sed administretur.' *Adv. Prax.* 3.

'Ceterum, qui Filium non aliunde deduco, sed de substantia Patris, nihil facientem sine Patris voluntate, omnem a Patre consecutum potestatem, quomodo possum de fide destruere monarchiam, quam a Patre Filio traditam, in Filio servo? Hoc mihi et in tertium gradum dictum sit, quia Spiritum non aliunde puto, quam a Patre, per Filium. Vide ergo ne tu potius monarchiam destruas, qui dispositionem et dispensationem ejus evertis, in tot nominibus constitutam, in quot Deus

voluit. Adeo autem manet in suo statu, licet Trinitas inferatur, ut etiam restitui habeat Patri a Filio. Siquidem Apostolus scribit de ultimo fine, "cum tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri." *Adv. Prax.* 6. Hippolytus says the same in a similar argument against the Patripassian Noetus: *Τίς γάρ οὐκ ἐπεὶ ἕνα Θεὸν εἶναι; ἀλλ' οὐ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἀναιρήσει, c. 3.* Again: *ἕνα Θεὸν νομίσαι μὴ δυνάμεθα, ἐὰν μὴ ὁντως Πάτρι καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι πιστεύσωμεν, c. 14.*

Τηροῖτο δ' αὖν, ὡς ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος, εἰς μὲν Θεός, εἰς ἕν αἷτιον καὶ νιοῦ καὶ πνεύματος ἀναφερομένων· οὐ συντιθεμένων, οὐδὲ συναλειφομένων· καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἕν καὶ παντὸ τῆς θεότητος, ἕνα οὕτως ὀνομάσω, κίνημά τε καὶ βούλημα, καὶ τὴν τῆς οὐσίας παντότητα. Greg. Naz. *Or.* xxix. *Vind. Cath.* i. 9.

Definition ever continue, unchangeably, invariably, and immutably the same; God, the Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghost eternal, One in Power, One in Glory, and One in Everlasting Majesty¹. In Unity of Substance there is this Trinity of Persons.

The term Person may be defined, as intelligent substance, subsisting in individual unity. There must be intelligence as the generic distinction; because nothing substantially irrational can subsist as a person. A human being may be accidentally, but he cannot be substantially irrational, therefore personal subsistence attaches to every human being. On the other hand, none of man's vassals in creation is endowed with reason; and however highly animal instinct may sometimes appear to range, it is far other than the intelligence, that can scan the past, the present, and inductively the future. But mere intelligence gives no complete notion of Person. Human reason is intelligent substance, but there is no personal idea attaching to it. There must be a distinct subsistence, or there can be no person; and that subsistence must have, together

¹ 'Ante omnia enim Deus erat, solus, ipse sibi et mundus, et locus, et omnia. Solus autem, quia nihil extrinsecus præter illum. Ceterum ne tunc quidem solus; habebat enim secum, quam habebat in semetipso, rationem suam scilicet. Rationalis enim Deus, et ratio in ipso prius; et ita ab ipso omnia; quæ ratio sensus ipsius est. Hanc Græci λόγον dicunt, quo vocabulo etiam sermonem appellamus,' &c. *Adv. Præz.* 5.

'Unus ergo et solus Deus;... non

ut ipse sit Pater et Filius, sicut impius Sabellius asserit; sed quia Patris et Filii, Spiritusque Sancti una Divinitas sit.' Ambros. *de Fide*, 11. 86.

'Quis igitur unitatem negare audeat nominis, cum operationis videat unitatem? Sed quid ego unitatem nominis argumentis adstruo; cum divinæ vocis evidens testimonium sit, unum nomen esse Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti?' Id. *de Sp.* S. I. 127.

with intelligence, its own peculiar individual character, its own unity of being. Thus the elements of which Adam was formed, while they remained in a disintegrated condition, had no aggregate subsistence, and therefore no individual character. When collected together in the human body of Adam, they had an individual subsistence, but still no personal character, until God breathed into man's nostrils the spirit of life, and he became a living being endowed with the spiritual intelligent substance of the soul; and then first commenced his personal subsistence. In him alone, before a help meet for him was created, person was coextensive with substance. The same definition applies to the three persons of the Godhead; always bearing it in mind, that the Substance of the Deity is One, the Perfection of Good. Such, therefore, as the Perfect Substance of the Deity is in the Father, the same is it in the Son, and the same in the Holy Ghost, wholly One, wholly Self-existent, and wholly Eternal. 'As the Father hath life in himself,' so also the Son hath life in Himself, and the Holy Ghost, the very Spirit of Life, hath life in Himself. As the will of the Father, so is the will of the Son, and the mind of the Spirit. As the Might and Majesty of the Father is revealed in the works of creation, the same manifestation of Power and Wisdom declares to us the Might and Majesty of the Son and Holy Spirit. All are one and the same eternal substance; so that, as the Nature of the Father is One in its Infinite Perfection, no other Nature than this, in the same Unity of Per-

of Person.

Distinction fection, is the Son's, by generation of the Father ; and the Holy Ghost's by Procession, in the same unity of Nature, from the Father and the Son. This therefore is the only object of our worship and adoration, One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity. Three Persons of one All-Wise Substance, subsisting in individual relation.

The same definition will assist us in realising the doctrinal statement that immediately follows :

4 NEQUE CONFUNDENTES PERSONAS, NEQUE SUBSTANTIAM SEPARANTES.

For if each person subsists in his own individual property, it is impossible that he should subsist in any other¹. Whatever property constitutes the person of the Father, cannot enter into the personal subsistence of the Son ; and the relative subordination of the Son, cannot be predicated of the original authority, and causative subsistence of the Father. So also of the Holy Spirit it is true, that He is of the same Eternal unity of Substance with the Father and the Son ; but his mode of subsistence, as proceeding from the Father and the Son, marks that individual relation to the Father and the Son, which belongs to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, and none other. If therefore to confuse the person of the Father and the Son, would involve manifold contradictions, no less absurd must it be, to confuse the person of the Holy

¹ 'Viderint igitur antichristi, qui negant Patrem et Filium. Negant enim Patrem, dum eundem Filium dicunt, et negant Filium,

dum eundem Patrem credunt ; dando illis, quæ non sunt, auferendo quæ sunt.' Tert. *adv. Prax.* 31.

Spirit with the person of the Father or the person of the Son, from both of whom he proceeds, and of both of whom He is the eternally co-equal Spirit. The Spirit stands in individual relation to the Divine persons from whom he proceeds; and believing in this individual relation, it is impossible that we should confound the person of the Holy Spirit, with the person of either the Father or the Son. So again, if in any measure we realise to ourselves the truth, that the substance of the Deity is absolute perfection, it will be impossible for us to imagine a personal, mutually correlative distinction between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, which shall involve the slightest infraction of that Unity, with which alone perfection can consist; the Divine Substance being One, it has been eternally One; although in this unity there has subsisted from all eternity, the Father, the One Cause of All; the Son, generated in the One Indivisible All-Perfect Nature of the Father; and the Holy Spirit, proceeding forth from the generating Father, and the generated Son, and Himself the very Spirit of both.

Tertullian, to whom many of the expressions in the Creed may be traced, clearly expresses the sense of this clause in the Athanasian Creed, where he says: ‘*Alium autem quomodo accipere debeas, jam professus sum; personæ non substantiæ nomine; ad distinctionem non ad divisionem*¹.’ Ambrose,

¹ *Adv. Prax.* 12. Again, ‘Cum quibus enim faciebat hominem, et quibus faciebat similem? Filio qui-

dem qui erat induturus hominem, Spiritu vero qui erat sanctificaturus hominem, quasi cum ministris et

Tertullian,
Ambrose.

the master-mind, possibly, that has been followed in this confession, not uncommonly serves as a connecting link between Tertullian and the Creed. So in the present instance: 'Est quædam indistincta distinctæ incomprehensibilis et inenarrabilis substantia Trinitatis. Distinctionem etenim accepimus Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, non confusionem; distinctionem non separationem; distinctionem non pluralitatem. Sed quis separet, quod non potest separari? Quis dividat societatem quam individuum Christus ostendit¹?'

arbitris, ex unitate Trinitatis loquebatur.' *Ibid.* The same arguments that Tertullian uses against Marcion in proving the Divine Unity, are quite as effective in demonstrating the truth that 'one God' in Trinity is to be worshipped. See Book i. On the other hand, Tertullian is equally express in condemnation of the Jewish unitarian notion: 'Ceterum Judaicæ fidei ista res, sic Deum unum credere, ut filium adnumerare ei nolis, et post Filium, Spiritum. Quid enim erit inter nos et illos, nisi differentia ista? Quod opus evangelii, quæ est substantia Novi Testamenti, statuens Legem et Prophetas usque ad Johannem, si non exinde Pater et Filius et Spiritus tres crediti, unum Deum sistunt?' *Adv. Prax.* 31.

¹ Ambros. *de Fide*, iv. 92. 'Loquitur in Christo Pater...non utique quasi corpus in corpore; non enim Deus corpus, nec quasi confusus in confuso; sed quasi verus in vero, Deus in Deo, lumen in lumine, quasi Pater sempiternus in Filio cœternio.' *Id. Sp. S.* iii. 92.

'Ejusdem autem impietatis est vel Patri, vel Filio, vel Spiritui

Sancto derogare. Non enim credit in Patrem, qui non credit in Filium; nec credit in Dei Filium, qui non credit in Spiritum; nec potest sine regula veritatis fides stare.' Ambros. *de Sp. S.* i. 30. ii. 69, 71.

'Rationem sequamur, quia qui unum dixerit, Trinitatem signavit. Si Christum dicas, et Deum Patrem a quo unctus est Filius, et ipsum qui unctus est, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum designasti.' *Ibid.* i. 37.

'Subter creatura omnis, supra Divinitas Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Illa servit hæc regnat. Illa subjacet, hæc dominatur. Illa opus, hæc auctor est operis. Illa adorat omnes, hæc adoratur ab omnibus.' *Ibid.* 39.

'Dic sane et tu Spiritum Sanctum unius cum Filio Dei et Deo Patre esse substantiæ, unius claritatis et gloriæ.' *Ibid.* 156.

'Quomodo enim non est eadem virtus, atque eadem potestas; cum unum opus, unum iudicium, unum templum, una vivificatio, una sanctificatio, unum etiam regnum sit Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti?' *Ibid.* ii. 25.

'Solam et veram Divinitatem

5 ALIA EST ENIM PERSONA PATRIS, ALIA FILII, <sup>Antagoni-
sing errors.</sup>
ALIA SPIRITUS SANCTI.

6 SED PATRIS ET FILII ET SPIRITUS SANCTI,
UNA EST DIVINITAS, ÆQUALIS GLORIA, COÆTERNA MA-
JESTAS.

It is manifest then, that in the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, there are two opposite classes of error, into either of which the spirit of incaution, or of reckless speculation, might insensibly fall; such an assertion of a Trinity of Personal Subsistence, as must involve triplicity of Substance; and such a maintenance of the *μοναρχία*, or Unity of the Deity, as must either exclude the Son and the Holy Spirit entirely from the Godhead, or describe them as emanative qualities without substance, and therefore without personal subsistence, put forth from the Deity for a season, and again absorbed into the Divine Nature.

sicut et Patris, ita et Filii et Spiritus Sancti confitebere.' *Ibid.* 28.

'Ergo unius, et Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, et naturæ sunt et scientiæ.' *Ibid.* 124.

'Quod si unius et voluntatis et operationis est cum Patre Deo Spiritus Sanctus, unius etiam substantiæ est; quoniam ex operibus suis Creator agnoscitur. Idem igitur Spiritus; idem, inquit, Dominus; idem, inquit, Deus. Et si Spiritum dicas, idem est; et si Dominum dicas, idem est, et si Deum dicas, idem est. Non idem ut ipse Pater, ipse Filius, ipse sit Spiritus; sed quia et Pater et Filius ejusdem est potestatis. Idem ergo est per substantiam, atque virtutem; quia non est in Divinitate vel Sabelliana confusio, vel Ariana discretio, vel terrena cor-

poralisque mutatio.' *Ibid.* p. 141.

'Quid aliud in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto, nisi ejusdem potestatis unitatem intelligere debemus?per unitatem potestatis coadoratur in Patre Christus, cum Deus Pater adoratur in Christo. Similiter itaque per unitatem potestatis ejusdem coadoratur in Deo Spiritus, dum Deus adoratur in Spiritu.' *Ibid.* III. 82.

'Similiter itaque adoratur et Spiritus, quia Deus adoratur in Spiritu. Ergo Pater et cum Filio adoratur, et cum Spiritu; quia Trinitas adoratur.' *Ibid.* 85.

'Nunc unitatem majestatis et regni licet in Patre, Filioque, et Sancto Spiritu cognoscere.' *Ibid.* 167.

Cerinthus,
Ebion,
Valentinus,

And, in fact, the course of the Ark of Christ's Church may be marked out by these rocks on either side, during the first ages of her existence; so that, to use Sherlock's words, 'Had we no other ways to know it, we might learn the faith of the Catholic Church, by its opposition to those heresies which it condemned.' The Church of every clime held one unvarying system of doctrine; and the extremes of error, also, may be observed to meet in one point, the negation of the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, from an assumed idea that One individual Nature can be but One Person, and *vice versa*, One Person but One Nature. Thus Cerinthus and Ebion believing that Jesus was mere man, acknowledged in him a distinct personal subsistence as the Son of Mary and Joseph. It was impossible for them to deny the Divinity of Christ; so they imagined, that a Divine emanation was united at Baptism with the Person of Jesus, but separated again from him at the Crucifixion; the personal subsistence of the Deity remaining, like the substance, single and sole. The mystery of God made flesh was denied, but the heretical confusion of ideas that Person is identical with Nature was maintained. Again, in the case of the Valentinian theory, that wild scheme was a manifest endeavour to copy the Catholic doctrine, and to express a plurality in unity, so far as the Principle of Good was concerned, by imagining one *πλήρωμα* or Plenitude of the Deity, who was himself the mysterious, unfathomable source of all the successive emanations that

came forth from Him, and in the aggregate made up that Plenitude¹. But so monstrous a form of error could only have obtained a hold upon men's fancies, when as yet the Gospel was little known; and men attempted to account for that little upon principles that were purely heathen.

As the Gospel began to spread and engage a larger attention, heresy became less distorted and repulsive in its appearance; though still the fundamental confusion of ideas may be traced in the notion, that personal subsistence is identical with unity of substance. So Praxeas in the South, and Noetus in the East, led the way for the more widely-spread error of Sabellius, by teaching the unity of the Deity, or the *μοναρχία*, in such a sense as declared that the Godhead subsisted in various modes on various occasions²: and that He manifested himself at one while as the Father, but at others, as the Son, and as the Holy Ghost. Believing therefore, as they did, that there was but one

Praxeas,
Noetus.

Verse 6.

¹ Even the Valentinian system was based upon the notion of the unity of the Good Principle: *Εἰ οὖν τὰ πάντα εἰς ἓνα ἀνατρέχει, καὶ κατὰ Οὐαλεντίνον, καὶ κατὰ Μαρκίωνα, Κήρινθον τε. κ.τ.λ.* Hippolyt. *c. Noet.* xi.

So also Irenæus, 'Omnes autem fere quotquot sunt hæreses, Deum quidem unum dicunt, sed per sententiam malam immutant.' *c. Hær.* i. 19.

'Qui sunt a Valentino omnes, quia lingua quidem confitentur unum Deum Patrem, et ex hoc omnia.... Linguas itaque eorum videlicet solas in unitatem cecidisse, sententiam vero eorum et sensum quæ profunda

sunt scrutari, decidentem ab unitate, incidere in multiforme Dei iudicium.' *Adv. Hær.* iv. 58.

'Honestior et liberalior Valentinus, qui simul ausus est duos concipere Bythum et Sigen, tum usque ad triginta æonum fœtus..... examen divinitatis effudit.' Tertull. *adv. Marc.* i. 5.

² 'Prolativum Verbum putant in Patrem redire; prolativum Spiritum in Deum refundi; ut unius refusio sit, et quædam vicissitudo in varias formas se sæpe mutantis; cum Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti manens semper, immutabilisque, distinctio, unitatem suæ teneat potestatis.' Ambros. *de Sp. S.* ii. 53.

Praxeas. Divine Substance, and one personal subsistence of the Deity; and further, that this Divine Substance was united with Christ crucified, it followed, that Patripassianism was the direct result; the one Person of the Deity being in Christ, whatever was suffered by Christ as God and Man, was inferentially, as applicable to the Father and the Holy Spirit, as to the Son¹.

The Catholic Faith is clearly expressed by Tertullian, in opening the subject of his argument against Praxeas: 'This heresy thinks that it is in possession of the very truth, while it imagines that the unity is in no other sense to be believed, than by affirming that one and the same person is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. As though one cannot therefore be the whole, because the whole is one by unity, of substance namely, and yet the mystery of the Dispensation be preserved, which sets forth the Unity in Trinity, by a triple definition of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: Three, that is, not in condition but degree; not in substance but form; not in power but species: but of one substance, and one condition, and one power; because God is one, to whom these degrees, and forms and species are referred, under the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost².

¹ Compare Tertull. *adv. Prax.* 29.

² 'Se existimat meram veritatem possidere, dum unicum Deum non alias putat credendum, quam si ipsum eundemque et Patrem et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum dicat. Quasi non sic quoque unus sit omnia, dum ex uno omnia, per sub-

stantiæ scilicet unitatem; et nihilominus custodiatur *οικονομία* sacramentum, quæ unitatem in Trinitate disponit, tres dirigens, Patrem et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum. Tres autem non statu sed gradu; nec substantia sed forma; nec potestate sed specie. Unius autem

Arianism, of course, was the exact converse of these opinions¹; though it was a different phase of the selfsame erroneous assumption, that unity of essence must involve unity of Person, and the reverse. Therefore, where each person of the Trinity was distinctly avowed, it followed that a distinctly separate substance was attributed to each, a different οὐσία, as well as an individual ὑπόστασις. Thus, it was held that the Father existed as the One Almighty Cause of all; but that the Son was created in time, of inferior substance with relation to the Father, not ὁμοούσιος; and that the Holy Spirit, again, had his own peculiar substance as well as a distinct personal being, whereby he was *sue naturæ*, as well as *sue proprietatis*².

Arius.

Such then are the antagonising and primitive forms of error, that are first disposed of in the Athanasian Creed; and if, as we have supposed, it was written in Gaul, and immediately after the close of the fourth century, a traditional orthodoxy would require allusion to the Arian, and corre-

substantiæ, et unius status, et unius potestatis; quia unus Deus, ex quo et gradus isti et formæ et species, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, deputantur.' Tertull. *adv. Prax.* 2.

¹ Arianism may be considered as a reaction from Sabellian Deism. The one heresy was the antagonism of the other. So Gregory of Nazianzum, *Or. xxix. Vind. Cath. i. 7*: προσκυνούμεν οὖν πατέρα, καὶ υἱόν, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τὰς μὲν ἰδιότη-τας χωρίζοντες, ἐνοῦντες δὲ τὴν θεότητα. καὶ οὔτε εἰς ἓν τὰ τρία

συναλείφομεν, ἵνα μὴ τὴν Σαβελλίου νόσον νοσήσωμεν· οὔτε διαιρούμεν εἰς τρία ἔκφυλα καὶ ἀλλότρια, ἵνα μὴ τὰ Ἀρείου μανῶμεν.

² It was the distinctive tenet of Arianism that the Son was created in time, and was therefore separate from the Father, and that the Holy Ghost also was a separate and distinct creation. Οἱ χρονικοὶς διαστήμασι τοῦ μὲν Πατρὸς τὸν Υἱόν, τοῦ δὲ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διαιρούσι. Basil. *M. de Sp. S. § 59. Vind. Cath. i. 418.*

Opening
clauses.

lately to the Sabellian heresy : although the Gallican Church had always remained more free from heretical taint, than any other branch of the Church Catholic. These two opposing forms of heresy therefore share between them the opening doctrinal clauses. The case is stated of the Catholic medium between the two, in the words, ‘Neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance;’ and the sense is then filled out more fully, as against the Sabellian first; ‘For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost;’ while the Arian is as pointedly condemned in the following clause, ‘But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the Glory equal, the Majesty coæternal.’ The words of Ambrose form a suitable conclusion to this article: ‘Quid sibi vult sub uno nomine sanctitatis trina repetitio? Si trina repetitio, cur una laudatio? Si una laudatio, cur trina repetitio? Trina repetitio cur, nisi quia Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus sanctitate unum sunt? Non dixit semel, ne Filium sequestraret; non bis, ne Spiritum præteriret; non quater ne creaturas conjungeret. Et ut ostenderet Trinitatis unam esse Deitatem, cum tertio dixisset, “Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus,” addidit singulariter; “Dominus Deus Sabaoth.” Sanctus igitur Pater, Sanctus Filius, Sanctus et Dei Spiritus. Adoratur igitur Trinitas, non adoratur; laudatur Trinitas non laudatur. Ego malo sicut Seraphim credere, et sicut omnes Potestates Virtutesque cœlestes adorare.’ *De Fi.* II. 107.

for. leg.
creaturam.

7 QUALIS PATER, TALIS FILIUS, TALIS ET SPIRITUS SANCTUS¹. Individual
relation.

The identity consists in the Divine Nature that is one and indivisible, the relative subsistence of the three persons being wholly incommunicable and peculiar. As the Father can have no filial quality of the Son, so no portion of the paternal

¹ This peculiarity of expression was not unknown to the Greek fathers. So Basil speaks of identity of nature in the Father and the Son: Ὑὶὸς γὰρ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ Πατὴρ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ. Ἐπειδὴ καὶ οὗτος τοιοῦτος, οἷος ἐκεῖνος, καὶ ἐκεῖνος, οἷος περ οὗτος· καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὸ ἓν. "Ὅστε κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἰδιότητα τῶν προσώπων, εἰς καὶ εἰς· κατὰ δὲ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς φύσεως, ἐν οἱ ἀμφοτέροι. Πῶς οὖν, εἴπερ εἰς καὶ εἰς, οὐχὶ δύο Θεοί; In the sequel he includes in the same way the person of the Holy Spirit in the unity of the Godhead of the Father and of the Son: Πατρὶ δὲ καὶ Υἱῷ κατὰ τοσοῦτον ἡνωται, καθόσον ἔχει μὲν πρὸς μὲν ἑκάστην τὴν οἰκειότητα. Bas. M. de Sp. S. § 45. *Vind. Cath.* i. 395.

Here, again, copious extracts in illustration might be collected from the writings of Ambrose, such as the following.

'Nam sicut Pater bonitatem habet et Filius, ita etiam bonitatem habet et Spiritus Sanctus..... Bonus ergo Spiritus, bonus autem, non quasi acquirens, sed quasi imperitens bonitatem.' Ambros. *de Sp. S.* i. 62, 67.

'Sic igitur venit Spiritus, quemadmodum venit Pater; quia ubi Pater est, ibi est et Filius; et ubi Filius est, ibi est Spiritus Sanctus ... Sic ergo et Spiritus venit, in quo cum venit, et Patris et Filii plena

præsentia est.' *Ibid.* 117, 118.

'Probatum est igitur quia sicut Deus nobis quæ sua sunt, ita et Filius quæ Dei sunt, ita etiam Spiritus revelavit. Ex uno enim Spiritu per unum Filium in unum Patrem cognitio nostra procedit; et ex uno Patre per unum Filium in unum Spiritum Sanctum bonitas et sanctificatio et imperiale jus æternæ traditur potestatis. Ubi ergo ostensio Spiritus, ibi Dei virtus; nec potest esse discretio, ubi opus unum est. Et ideo quod loquitur Filius, loquitur et Pater; et quod Pater loquitur, loquitur et Filius; et quod loquitur Pater et Filius, loquitur et Spiritus Sanctus.' *Ibid.* ii. 129.

'Nam sicut sanctificat Pater, ita sanctificat et Filius, sanctificat et Spiritus Sanctus.' *Ibid.* iii. 26.

'Habet igitur consortium regni cum Patre et Filio etiam Spiritus Sanctus, qui unius naturæ, unius dominationis, unius etiam potestatis est.' *Ibid.* 160.

'Habes quia creavit Pater, creavit et Spiritus; accipe quia creavit et Filius Dei, dicente Salomone, "Sapientia fecit sibi domum." Ergo Spiritus Sanctus, qui creavit Dominicæ Incarnationis sacramentum, quod super omnes est creaturas, quomodo esse potest creatura?..... sicut creat Pater, ita creat et Filius, ita creat et Spiritus Sanctus.' Ambros. *de Sp. S.* ii. 60, 61.

Arian
test.

relation can belong to the Son, and neither Pater-
nity nor Sonship attaches to the Holy Spirit, pro-
ceeding forth from the Father and the Son; while
it is equally impossible that the Father or the Son
should proceed forth from the Holy Spirit of them
both. Such as the Father is, therefore, in sub-
stance, such is the Son, remaining Son; and such
is the Holy Ghost, continuing in like manner Holy
Ghost.

8 INCREATUS PATER, INCREATUS FILIUS, INCREA-
TUS ET SPIRITUS SANCTUS.

This is the very test of Arianism. For Arius
taught that the Father alone is uncreate, and of
a different substance from the Son and the Holy
Spirit, denying the *ὁμοουσία*, while the Son and Holy
Spirit were created in time, from that which was
not; that they were not eternally existent, nor self-
subsisting, nor of the same substance with the God-
head. But long before the day of Arius, Catholic
writers had expressed themselves with great dis-
tinctness, concerning the eternal generation of the
Son. Thus Hippolytus¹: 'It is sufficient therefore
for us to know this one thing alone, that nothing
was coæval with God, beside Himself; but Himself,
being alone, was many; for He was neither without
the Word, nor without Wisdom, nor without power,
nor without counsel; but all things were in Him,

¹ Ἀνταρκὲς οὖν ἡμῖν ἐστὶν μόνου
εἶδέναι ὅτι σύγχρονον Θεοῦ οὐδὲν
πλὴν αὐτοῦ ἦν, αὐτὸς δὲ μόνος ὢν
πολλὸς ἦν, οὔτε γὰρ ἀλογος, οὔτε
ἄστροφος, οὔτε ἀδύνατος, οὔτε ἀβού-
λευτος ἦν, πάντα δὲ ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ,

αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν τὸ πᾶν.....καὶ οὕτως
παρίστατο αὐτῷ ἕτερος.....τὸ δὲ
πᾶν Πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ δύναμις Λόγος,
οὗτος δὲ Νῦν ὃς προβάς ἐν κόσμῳ
ἐδείκνυτο παῖς Θεοῦ. Hippolyt. c.
Noet. x. 11.

and He was all things...And thus a second was present with Him...God was all things, of whom is the Divine power, the Word; and He is the Intelligence, that coming forth into the world was revealed as the Son of God.' It would almost seem, that either he had read the following words of Tertullian, or that both perhaps drew upon some still more ancient Greek authority: ^{Tertullian, Hippolytus.} '1 For God was before all things, alone, Himself the universe to Himself, and space, and all things. But He was alone, because there was nothing externally beside Him. And yet not even so was He alone; for He had with Himself, that which He had in Himself, to wit, His Counsel. For God is with Counsel, and Counsel was antecedently in Him, and so all things were from Him; which Counsel is His Mind. The Greeks call this Λόγος, with which our Word, [as well as Reason], is synonymous.'

And here it may be observed, that in all probability the Arian error would never have been so widely disseminated, had it not been for an unfortunate misinterpretation in the Greek version of Scripture, the sole authoritative standard of Divine truth in the Alexandrian and Eastern Patriarchates. The passage, Prov. viii. 22, which in the Hebrew stands, יְהוָה קָנָנִי רֵאשִׁית יְרֵכָו, is rendered by the Greek translator, Κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχῆν

¹ 'Ante omnia enim Deus erat, solus, ipse sibi et mundus, et locus, et omnia. Solus autem; quia nihil extrinsecus præter illum. Ceterum ne tunc quidem solus; habebat enim secum, quam habebat in semet ipso,

rationem suam scilicet. Rationalis enim Deus, et ratio in ipso prius; et ita ab ipso omnia, quæ ratio sensus ipsius est. Hanc Græci Λόγον dicunt, quo vocabulo etiam Sermone[m] appellamus.' Tertull. *c. Prax.* v.

Eternal
wisdom.

John i.
1 Cor. iv. 21.

ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ; and the subject being the Divine Wisdom, whereby all things were created, identified with the Word by St John, and with Christ by St Paul, it followed, that if the Greek rendering were right, a certain degree of support could be claimed for the Arian heresy, from these terms of Scripture. At first, and for a long time, the Fathers endeavoured to explain the difficulty, by treating the word ἔκτισε as our term ‘created,’ referring to appointment and ordination to some new office of dignity. Eusebius was the first who pointed out that the Greek words were not that faithful interpretation of the original, which alone could be decisive in a controversy concerning the faith. He says, ‘If therefore any person be desirous of ascertaining with accuracy the real sense of the inspired words, he shall find that the Hebrew text does not express “created me,” neither do the other interpreters read it so. Aquila has, “The Lord possessed me, the chief of his ways;” and Symmachus, “The Lord possessed me, the beginning of his ways,” and Theodotion similarly; and their interpretation will hold.... Hence the first man Adam, when he possessed the first son born among men, said, “I have got a man through the Lord.”’ The

¹ Εἰ γοῦν τίς ἐξακριβῶσαιτο τὸν ἀληθῆ νοῦν τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς, εὗροι ἂν τὴν Ἑβραϊκὴν ἀνάγνωσιν, οὐ περιέχουσαν τὸ, ἔκτισέ με, διόπερ οὐδὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐρμηνευτῶν ταύτῃ τίς κέχρηται τῇ λέξει· αὐτίκα δ’ οὖν ὁ μὲν Ἀκύλας, Κύριος ἐκτίσατό με κεφάλαιον τῶν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ, εἶρηκεν ὁ δὲ Σύμμαχος, Κύριος ἐκτίσατό με ἀρχὴν

ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ· ὁ δὲ Θεοδοτίων, Κύριος ἐκτίσατό με ἀρχὴν ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἔχει γ’ ἂν λόγον ἡ ἐρμηνεία.....” Εὐθεν καὶ ὁ πρωτόπλαστος Ἀδάμ, ὅτε τὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις πρῶτον Υἱὸν ἐκτίσατο, ἐλέχθη καὶ ἐπ’ ἐκείνῳ, ἐκτίσαμήν ἀνθρώπον διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Euseb. de Eccl. Theol. III. 2. Vind. Cath. I. 550.

Hebrew text therefore, implies, to have by generation; the verb *Cana* being the root, from whence Eve derived the name of her firstborn Cain, manifestly as the fruit of procreation, and not of 'creation.' By a further development of idea, it is true, the root *قن* in the Arabic would seem to have acquired the sense of 'creation¹,' but there is no trace of any such meaning in Hebrew; and nothing can be more mischievous than to apply the phenomena of language, as it existed a century or two back, as an infallible key to the meaning of the venerable words of Scripture, written more than two thousand years before². A more general knowledge of the Hebrew language, in redeeming this text from misappropriation, might perhaps have saved many years of darkness and confusion to the Church. Failing this knowledge, the Greek text was treated as the infallible exposition of the Divine Will; and even after the true meaning of the passage had been indicated by Eusebius, we still find the Fathers stumbling whenever they approached it.

Prov. viii.
22.

¹ So the Arabic Lexicon, the *Kamûs* among other senses of the root

قن gives the following: *قنه الله*
خلقه creavit tamquam Deus.

For fuller information on Prov. viii. 22, see a 'Prælectio Academica,' by the author. Messrs. Parker, and Deighton, 1848.

² Athanasius gets at a right result by a catholic instinct, when he offers this explanation: *οὐκ ἔρα τῇ φύσει καὶ οὐσία κτίσμα ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ὡς αὐτὸς ἐπήγαγε γέννημά*

ἐστι. Athanas. *c. Arianos*, II. 80. *Vind. Cath.* II. 367.

Tertullian gives a similar solution of the difficulty, 'Hæc vis et hæc divini sensus dispositio, apud scripturas etiam in Sophiæ nomine ostenditur. Quid enim sapientius ratione Dei sive *τῆς* *σοφίας*? Itaque Sophiam quoque exaudi, ut secundam personam conditam; primo "Dominus creavit me initium viarum in opera sua, priusquam terram faceret, priusquam montes collocarentur; ante omnes autem colles generavit me." In sensu scilicet suo condens, et generans.' *Adv. Prax.* 6.

Basil.

Arius then denied that the Son was uncreate; the Semi-Arian or Macedonian party, carrying the error a step further, declared that the Holy Spirit also was of created substance; and it is in contravention of either subdivision of the same great class of heretics, that the Church affirms; 'Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost; the Father uncreate, the Son uncreate, and the Holy Ghost uncreate.'

9 IMMENSUS PATER, IMMENSUS FILIUS, IMMENSUS ET SPIRITUS SANCTUS.

The method of expressing the unity of the Divine Substance by the application of one and the same attributive term to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, was no new peculiarity of theological language. Basil, shortly after the middle of the fourth century, deduces the same terminology from the words of Scripture. So he compares the perfections of the Holy Spirit with that which is declared of the Father and of the Son, 'He is called Spirit, as it is written, God is a Spirit. And the Spirit of our¹ countenance is Christ the Lord.

Lam. iv. 20.
LXX.

¹ The context would seem to infer the reading *αὐτοῦ* indicated by Tertullian, 'Spiritus personæ ejus Christus Dominus,' ergo si Christus personæ paternæ spiritus est, &c. *Adv. Prax.* 14. The same reading is evidently required, *adv. Marc.* III. 6.

Πνεῦμα ὠνόμασται· ὡς, Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός. καὶ, Πνεῦμα τοῦ προσώπου ἡμῶν Χριστὸς Κύριος. ἅγιον· ὡς, ἅγιος ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ ἅγιος ὁ Υἱός· τῇ μὲν γὰρ κτίσει, ἐτέρωθεν ἐπεισ-ίχθη ὁ ἀγιασμός· τῷ δὲ Πνεύματι

συμπληρωτικὴ τῆς φύσεως ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγιότης· διόπερ οὐχὶ ἀγιαζόμενόν ἐστιν ἀλλ' ἀγιάζον. ἀγαθόν· ὡς ἀγαθὸς ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ ἀγαθὸς ὁ ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ γεννηθεὶς, οὐσίαν ἔχον τὴν ἁγρότητα. εὐθές· ὡς εὐθέις Κύριος ὁ Θεός· τῷ εἶναι αὐτοαλήθεια, καὶ αὐτοδικαιοσύνη, παρεκτροπᾶς ἐπὶ θάτερα καὶ ἐκκλίσεις οὐκ ἔχον, διὰ τὸ ἀτρεπτον τῆς οὐσίας. παράκλητος, ὡς ὁ μονογενής· καθὼς αὐτὸς φησιν· ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν Πατέρα μου, καὶ δώσει ὑμῖν ἄλλου παράκλητου. οὕτω κοινὰ τὰ ὀνό-

He is called Holy, as the Father is Holy, and the Son is Holy. Sanctification, indeed, is in the case of the creature, adventitious. But in the Spirit, Holiness is the very fulness of His nature; wherefore He is not the recipient, but the cause of sanctification. He is Good, as the Father is Good, and as He is Good who is begotten of the Good, and he has Goodness as His substance. He is True, as the Lord God is True, in that He is the very Truth, and very Righteousness, having no turning of any kind, nor deflection, by reason of the Immutability of His Being. He is the Comforter, as was the Only Begotten, for he says, I will ask my Father, and he shall give you another Comforter. Thus names, that are common to the Father and the Son, are common also to the Holy Spirit, who obtains these titles, by virtue of identity of nature.' Ἀκατά-
ληπτος.

Ps. xcii. 14.

With respect to the particular term under consideration, the word *immensus*, the definition of Venantius, may be accepted; 'Non est mensurabilis in sua natura, quia illocalis est, incircumscrip- tus, ubique totus, ubique præsens, ubique potens.' The English word 'incomprehensible' clearly has reference to the Greek term ἀκατάληπτος; it having been presumed, possibly, that the Greek was the original text. This one word, however, would prove that the Latin form was the original, from the fact that the same word *immensus* occurs in every Latin copy, whereas in the Greek it has been

ματα πρὸς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν τῷ πνεύματι, ἐκ τῆς κατὰ τὴν φύσιν οἰκειότητος τῶν προσηγοριῶν τούτων τυγχόντι. Bas. M. de Sp. S. § 48. Vind. Cath. i. 400.

Ἀκατά-
ληπτος.

variously rendered by ἀκατάληπτος, ἄπειρος, and ἄμετρος. But taking the word ἀκατάληπτος as our original, it is explained by St Chrysostom as unfathomable. 'The ocean' is called ἀκατάληπτος, into which the divers plunging, and carried down to a great depth, are unable to find the ground.' It is needless to quote passages, in which *immensus* would bear the same meaning. But more generally, both the Greek and Latin term may be taken to mean infinity, according to the interpretation of Ambrose, or of Hilary. 'Nihil præscriptum, nihil circumscriptum, nihil emensum, nihil dimensum, Trinitas habet. Non loco clauditur, non opinione comprehenditur, non æstimatione concluditur, non ætate variatur².' 'Ergo, quia Deus invisibilis, incomprehensibilis, immensus est, ait Dominus venisse tempus, ut non in monte vel templo Deus sit adorandus, quia Spiritus Deus est, et Spiritus nec circumscribitur, nec tenetur; qui per naturæ suæ virtutem ubique est, neque usquam abest, omnibus omnis exuberans³.' Tertullian would seem to have had both significations of the word ἀκατάληπτος in his mind, when he wrote, 'Ceterum scimus Deum etiam intra abyssos esse, et ubique consistere, sed vi et potestate.' Cyprian expresses the sense of the word with his usual elegance: 'Deus nec videri potest, visu clarior est; nec comprehendī, tactu purior est; nec æstimari, sensu major est; et ideo sic eum digne æstimamus,

¹ Ἀκατάληπτον λέγεται πελαγὸς, εἰς ὃ καθιέντες ἑαυτοὺς οἱ κολυμβηταί, καὶ πρὸς πολλὸν καταφερόμενοι βάθος, τὸ πέραν ἀδυνατοῦσιν

εὕρειν. Chrys. π. τ. ἀκαταλήπτ.

² Hilar. de Trin. II. 31. Vind. Cath. I. 30.

³ Ambros. in Luc. II. 13.

dum inæstimabilem dicimus.' Cypr. *Ep.* LVII. 'Vere enim magna sunt thesaurophyllacia cœlestia,' are the words of Irenæus, 'immensurabilis est in corde Deus, et incomprehensibilis in animo, qui comprehendit terram pugillo....Manum ejus quis intelliget, eam quæ mensurat immensa, eam quæ tendit mensura sua mensuram cœlorum, et constringit pugillo terram cum abyssis, quæ in se continet latitudinem et longitudinem et profundum deorsum, et altitudinem supernam universæ conditionis,' &c. *c. Hær.* iv. 36. 'Cum oporteat Deum horum omnium pleroma in immenso omnia circumcontinere, et circumcontineri a nemine. Si autem extra illum est aliquid, jam non omnium est pleroma, neque continet omnia.' Iren. III. 1. To the Son alone the Father is comprehensible; 'Et bene, qui dixit ipsum immensum Patrem in Filio mensuratum; mensura enim Patris, Filius, quoniam et capit eum.' iv. 8.

Patristical
explanation.

The meaning of the Greek word is expressed in the latter sense, though not actually used, in the definition of the Council of Antioch¹; and saying that God is 'Incomprehensible,' we mean that 'Human nature cannot attain to the conception or the expression of his glory and power, as they exist, and according to the truth; his beloved Son hath revealed Him, so far as we are able to receive any limited idea of His Being.'

10 ÆTERNUS PATER, ÆTERNUS FILIUS, ÆTERNUS ET SPIRITUS SANCTUS.

¹ Οὐ τὴν δόξαν ἢ τὸ μέγεθος νοῆσαι ἢ ἐξηγήσασθαι καθὼς ἐστὶν ἀξίως τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀνθρωπίνη φύσει ἀνέφικτον· ἐννοίαν δὲ καὶ ὁπω-

σοῦν μετρίαν· περὶ αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν ἀγαπητοῦ ἀποκαλύπτοντος τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. Conc. Antioch. *ep. ad Paulum Samos. Vind. Cath.* i. 98.

Terms
older than
Augustine

11 ET TAMEN NON TRES ÆTERNI SED UNUS
ÆTERNUS;

12 SICUT NON TRES INCREATI, NEC TRES IMMENSI,
SED UNUS INCREATUS, ET UNUS IMMENSUS.

13 SIMILITER, OMNIPOTENS PATER, OMNIPOTENS
FILIUS, OMNIPOTENS ET SPIRITUS SANCTUS;

14 ET TAMEN NON TRES OMNIPOTENTES, SED
UNUS OMNIPOTENS.

These words would need no commentary, if it were not for that peculiarity of phraseology, that Waterland notices as a convincing evidence that the Creed was composed after the time of Augustine; the expression of Triune Perfection 'by a singular adjective, unus æternus,' &c. It has already been shewn that the mode of expression, as applied to the Trinity, is first observable in the writings of Ambrose¹, that it was adopted by Faustinus, and that Augustine confessedly reduced to a definite system those theological statements that were already current in the Church concerning the Trinity in Unity²; 'That the idea of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, of one and the selfsame substance, involves by their inseparable equality the Divine Unity, and therefore that they are not three Gods, but one God.' But long before this mode of speaking was applied to the elucidation of the doctrine of the Trinity, it had been used in refutation of the Gnostic di-archichal notion. Tertullian expresses himself exactly as the writer of the Creed,

p. 560.

¹ 'Ergo Sanctus Pater, Sanctus Filius, Sanctus et Spiritus; sed non tres Sancti; quia unus est Deus

Sanctus, unus est Dominus.' Ambros. *de Sp. S.* III. 111.

² Aug. *de Trin.* I. 7. *supr.* p. 561.

when he says, in arguing against Hermogenes, 'And [according to you] the condition of matter is the same; wherefore, for the same reason, there is one condition common to the Deity and to matter; that is, to two eternals, as being equally not born and not made; each equally possessing that which admits of neither diminution nor subordination, that is, eternity. We affirm then, that neither is less nor greater than other, neither is lower nor higher than other.' The terms, 'duo æterni, innati, infecti,' are closely parallel with the expressions, 'Tres æterni, immensi, omnipotentes,' &c. found in the Creed.

a mark of
date.

Seeing, therefore, that the very mode of expression fixed upon by Waterland, as containing a mark of date later than the writings of Augustine, is found in Tertullian two whole centuries before; and considering likewise the scanty proportion of early Christian records that have been preserved to us in the Latin language, we may fairly object to the chronological inference, that has been drawn from this peculiarity of phraseology in the Athanasian Creed. It would rather seem that the composer of the Creed made use of terms already familiar to Catholic ears, although Augustine, in vindicating the doctrines contained in it, from the onslaught of the Arian faction, may have made a

¹ 'Et materiæ autem status talis est, igitur et duobus æternis, ut innatis, ut infectis, Deo atque materiæ ob eandem rationem communis status, ex æquo habentibus id, quod neque diminui, nec subjici admittit,

id est, æternitatem; neutrum dicimus altero esse maiorem sive majorem; neutrum altero humiliorem, sive superiorem,' etc. Tertull. *adv. Hermog.* vii.

The form
of words

larger application of those terms than usual in his books on the Trinity.

Passing over the terms, 'non tres increati, nec tres immensi,' as already sufficiently explained and illustrated, and the word 'omnipotens¹,' which, as the equivalent of παντοκράτωρ, or παντοδύνατος, has been discussed in the proper places of the two former Creeds, the next clauses that arise are ;

15 ITA DEUS PATER, DEUS FILIUS, DEUS ET SPIRITUS SANCTUS ;

16 ET TAMEN NON TRES DII, SED UNUS EST DEUS.

17 ITA DOMINUS PATER, DOMINUS FILIUS, DOMINUS ET SPIRITUS SANCTUS ;

18 ET TAMEN NON TRES DOMINI, SED UNUS EST DOMINUS.

These words again are possibly constructed upon the doctrinal model of Ambrose ; 'Unum ergo Deum, non duos, aut tres deos dicimus, ut impia Arianorum hæresis, dum criminatur, incurrit. Tres enim deos dicit, qui divinitatem separat Trinitatis².'

¹ There is a similarity between this term of the creed and the words of Ambrose, so far as they reach ; 'Ergo et Patris et Filii omnipotentia, sed tamen Deus unus omnipotens ; quia unitas potestatis est.' Ambros. *de Fide*, II. 36.

² Ambros. *de Fide*, I. 10.

So again, 'Itaque dicendo Patris et Filii discretam substantiam, differentemque Deitatem, duos utique ipsi deos asserunt ; nos autem cum et Patrem confitemur, et Filium, asserendo tamen unius esse Deitatis

non duos deos, sed unum Deum dicimus.....Unus autem Deus dicitur, et Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti gloria et plenitudo signatur.' Ambros. *de Fide*, v. 42.

'Non ergo aliud nomen Filii, aliud nomen Spiritus Sancti ; quia unus Deus ; non plura nomina, quia non duo dii, non tres dii.' Id. *de Sp. S.* I. 127.

'Sed quid veremini ? an illud quod oblatrare consuestis, ne tres faciatis deos ? Absit ; ubi enim una Deitas intelligitur, unus Deus dici-

The same observation that was made with reference to the term, 'tres æterni,' holds good with respect to 'Tres Dii,' namely, that the mode of speaking whereby early Catholic writers had denied the Gnostic duality of two eternal principles, Intellect and Matter, by a modified application, was now used to deny the Arian triplicity of three distinct natures in the Godhead. In fact, this way of speaking was naturally adopted by Catholic writers, whenever they had occasion to vindicate the truth against any heretical infraction of the unity of the One Eternal Principle, as well as in defending themselves against the Sabellian charge of making a triple division of the Divine substance¹. It has already been observed, that every heresy professed to inculcate unity, either of the eternally good principle, if of a Gnostic form,

more ancient than the creed.

tur. Neque enim cum Filium Deum dicimus, duos deos dicimus. Nam si cum Deitatem Spiritus confitemini, putatis tres deos dici; ergo et cum Deitatem Filii dicitis, quia non potestis eam negare, duos inducitis deos.....Sicut unum Deum dicimus, et Patrem vero Deitatis nomine confitemur, nec Filium denegantes; ita etiam Spiritum Sanctum a Deitatis non excludimus unitate; et tres deos non asserimus, sed negamus, quia pluralitatem non unitas facit sed divisio potestatis.' *Ibid.* III. 94, 95.

Further, the clauses of the creed are not more closely parallel than the doctrinal phrases of the Father; and having shewn that the Christian faith does not involve a plurality of Gods, he proceeds to deny a plurality of Lords, 'Sed fortassis

iterum dicas; Si Dominum Spiritum dixeris, tres Dominos declarabo.....quemadmodum duos non dicimus Dominos, cum et Patrem et Filium designamus; ita nec tres Dominos dicimus, cum Dominum Spiritum confitemur. Sicut enim sacrilegium est tres dominos aut deos dicere, ita,' &c. Ambros. *de Sp. S.* III. 106, 109.

¹ The expression may be compared, 'Sicut enim Pater virtus, ita et Filius virtus, et Spiritus Sanctus est virtus.....Quomodo enim non est una virtus atque eadem potestas? cum unum opus, unum iudicium, unum templum, una vivificatio, una sanctificatio, unum etiam regnum sit Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti.' Ambros. *de Sp. S.* II. 19, 25.

Irenæus. although matter was maintained to be coeternal, or of the Divine Personality of the Godhead, if of a Sabellian cast. While the Arian party, failing to perceive the necessary distinction between Substance and Person, and imagining that the one must of necessity be coextensive in its application with the other, allowed indeed the unity of the Divine Substance in God the Father, but held that the person of the Son existed only in his own individual created substance; and that the Substance and Person of the Holy Ghost had a similar origin in time. In every age of the Christian Church, therefore, there had existed ample scope for expressions exactly parallel with those now under consideration; and in every age accordingly we find them. So Irenæus says of the Marcionites; ‘*Duos naturaliter dicentes deos, distantes ab invicem, alterum quidem bonum, alterum autem malum;*’ and, ‘*Marcion igitur ipse dividens Deum in duo, alterum quidem bonum, et alterum judiciale dicens, ex utrisque interimit Deum.*’

Iren. c. Hær.
iii. 12, 43.

Tertullian confirms the statement; ‘*Duos Ponticus Deos affert, tamquam duas symplegadas naufragii sui;*’ afterwards by the addition of Space to the two principles of the Demiurge and Matter, he falls into the same mode of expression with the Creed; ‘*Atque ita tres interim mihi deos numera Marcionis, factorem, et locum, et materiam*’.

¹ Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* i. 2. Eusebius quotes a similar statement of an ancient historical writer named Rhodon: ἄλλοι δὲ πάλιν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἐξοκειλάντες, οὐ μὲν

νον δύο, ἀλλὰ καὶ τρεῖς ὑποτίθενται φύσεις. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 13. These were the Good Principle or God of the Christian Church, the severe God of the Jews, and the

Again, with reference to the Sabellian cavil; Tertullian.
 ‘Itaque duos et tres jam jactitant a nobis prædicari, se vero unius Dei cultores præsumunt; quasi non et unitas irrationaliter collecta hæresim faciat, et trinitas rationaliter expensa, veritatem constituat.’ *Adv. Prax.* 3. Elsewhere Tertullian defends the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity against the Unitarian notion of Praxeas, by exhibiting the threefold personal subsistence of the Deity in the one undivided Substance of the Godhead; and he expresses himself in terms that are altogether similar to those of the Creed; the writer of which is quite as likely to have moulded his phraseology on the type of Tertullian, as of Augustine. Making all necessary allowance for the different argumentative position, the following words of Tertullian will be found to be altogether in keeping with the clause now under consideration: ‘¹ Wherefore, you say, if God hath spoken, and God hath made; if one God hath spoken, and another hath made,

Evil Principle of the Gentiles. Theodoret, *Hær. Fab.* 1. 24, says that Marcion taught that there were four ἀγεννήτοι οὐσίαι, namely the three now given, and matter the matrix of evil. Though Tertullian gives another account of the quaternion, as the creator, space, and matter, with the addition of evil, eternally inherent in the uncreate matter: ‘Amplius, et malum materiæ deputans, innatum innatæ, infectum infectæ, et æternum æternæ, quantum tum jam hinc deum fecit.’ Then he sums the eternal principles of Marcion as being nine in number; ‘in superioribus tres substantias divini-

tatis (viz. the God of Christians, of the Jews, and of the Gentiles), in inferioribus quatuor;’ (the Demiurge, matter, space, and evil), which with the addition of the Christ that hath appeared, and the Christ still promised by the Creator, make the number; and he adds, ‘Manifestam jam fraudem Marcion patitur ab eis, qui duos illum deos inferre præsumunt, cum novem assignet licet nesciens.’ *Adv. Marc.* 1. 15.

¹ ‘Ergo, inquis, si Deus dixit, et Deus fecit, si alius deus dixit, et alius deus fecit, duo dii prædicantur.....accipe et in Psalmo duos deos dictos, “Thronus tuus, Deus, in

Tertullian. there is an avowal of two Gods....Hear now from the Psalm how there are two that are called God; "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever...wherefore God hath anointed thee, even thy God."... Moreover I read that the name of Lord is ascribed to two; "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit on my right hand."... Well then, you say, I will challenge you to avow at once, consistently with the authority of these Scriptures, two Gods and two Lords. Far from it.... We define indeed that there are two, the Father and the Son, nay, three, with the Holy Ghost;... yet this we never utter with our lips, that there are two Gods or two Lords; not as though the Father were not God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God; nor as though God were not each individually.' Afterwards he says in the same work; 'If they are unwilling that the Son should be accounted second with relation to the Father, lest by being second it should be thought that the inference arises, that there are two Gods; we shew that even in Scripture there are two who are said to be God and Lord; and that they may not take offence at this, we explain, that they are not said

ævum.....propterea unxit te Deus, Deus tuus.".....Sed et nomen Domini in duobus lego. "Dixit Dominus Domino meo, Sede ad dexteram meam."... Ergo inquis provocabo te, ut hodie quoque ex auctoritate istarum Scripturarum constanter duos Deos et duos dominos prædices. Absit.....duos quidem definimus, Patrem et Filium, et jam tres cum Spiritu Sancto.....Duos tamen Deos et duos dominos nunquam ex ore proferimus; non quasi non et Pater

Deus et Filius Deus, et Spiritus Deus, et Deus unusquisque,' &c. Tertull. *adv. Prax.* xiii.

¹ 'Si Filium nolunt secundum a Patre reputari, ne secundus duos faciat deos dici; ostendimus etiam duos deos in scriptura relatos et duos dominos; et tamen ne de isto scandaliscentur, rationem reddimus, quia dei, non duo dicantur, nec domini, sed, quia Pater et Filius, duo; et hoc non ex separatione substantiæ, sed ex dispositione.' *Adv. Prax.* xix.

to be two, as Gods and Lords, but two, as Father and Son; and this not by division of substance, but relatively,' &c. Hippolytus.

The words of the Creed, that there are not three Gods or three Lords, might be referred quite as naturally to such passages of Tertullian, as to the writings of Augustine. Hippolytus, a few years later, argued similarly against the similar præ-Sabellian opinions of Noetus; 'And thus a second was present with God. But when I say a second, it is not as though there were two Gods, but as light of light...If therefore the Word was with God, and was God, what then? will it be said that I mention two Gods? I mention not two Gods, but one; two persons, however, and as the third dispensation, the grace of the Holy Spirit. For the Father in truth is one, but (as in this Scripture) the persons are two, for there is the Son; while the Holy Ghost is third....The harmonious Dispensation is blended together in the unity of the Godhead; for God is One....The Divine Being is Father over all, Son through all, and Holy Ghost in all. Otherwise we cannot imagine one God, unless we really believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.'

¹ Καὶ οὕτως παρίστατο αὐτῷ ἕτερος. "Ἐτερον δὲ λέγων οὐ δύο θεοὺς λέγω, ἀλλ' ὡς φῶς ἐκ φωτόςΕἰ δὲ οὖν ὁ Λόγος πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, Θεὸς ὢν, τί οὖν; φήσκειν ἂν τις, δύο λέγειν Θεούς; δύο μὲν οὐκ ἐρῶ θεοὺς ἀλλ' ἡ ἕνα, πρόσωπα δὲ δύο, οἰκονομίαν δὲ τρίτην τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος· Πατὴρ μὲν γὰρ εἷς, πρόσωπα δὲ δύο, ὅτι

καὶ ὁ Υἱός, τὸ δὲ τρίτον τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.....Οἰκονομία συμφωνίας συνάγεται εἰς ἕνα Θεόν, εἰς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός.....'Ο ὩΝ Πατὴρ ἐπὶ πάντων, ὁ δὲ Υἱὸς διὰ πάντων, τὸ δὲ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐν πᾶσιν. Ἄλως τε ἕνα Θεόν νομίσαι μὴ δυνατόν, ἐὰν μὴ ὄντως Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι πιστεύσωμεν. Hippolyt. c. Noet. xiv.

Faith in the
Trinity

It is evident, from such passages, that the language of this article of the Athanasian Creed was not unknown to writers of the second and third centuries; and very possibly Augustine alluded no less to the established phraseology of controversial writing, than to Catholic doctrines, when he said, ‘*Omnes quos legere potui qui ante me scripserunt de Trinitate...hoc intenderunt secundum Scripturas docere, quod Pater et Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus, unius ejusdemque substantiæ inseparabili æqualitate divinam insinuent unitatem; ideoque non sint tres dii sed unus Deus.*’ In the next age statements abound in vindication of the Catholic doctrine against the Arian notion of a Trinity of Natures, and they are expressed, as might be expected, very much in the established phraseology; so that there is scarcely a tract against the Arian heresy, from which expressions might not be quoted similar to the words of the Creed, e. g. ‘*Ἐἰς ἑναντίον μὲν, κακὸν δὲ ἴσον πεσεῖν τρεῖς ἀρχὰς ὑποτιθεμένους, καὶ τρεῖς Θεούς.*’ ‘*ὅτε τρεῖς ἀρχὰς, ὅτε τρεῖς θεούς, ὅτε τρεῖς διαφόρους καταγγέλλομεν φύσεις.*’ ‘*Μήτε δὲ εἰρηκέναι τρεῖς θεούς ἢ τρεῖς ἀρχὰς,*’ κ.τ.λ.

The passage from Hippolytus recalls to mind the assertion not unfrequently found in the Fathers, that the great safeguard for belief in the Unity of the Deity, is faith in the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. As this most certain truth has a practical bearing upon religious opinion in the pre-

¹ Greg. Naz. *Or. Vind. Cath.* Cath. i. 455.

i. 8.

² Athanas. *Tomus ad Antioch.*

³ Amphiloeh. *Ep. Synod. Vind.* Vind. Cath. i. 131.

sent day, a few words upon the subject will not be out of place. If then we could imagine it possible that the Epicurean notion of a non-providential Deity could be true, unity of Person might in such a case consist well with unity of Divine Substance¹. But the care that God takes of his creatures is a matter of proof, and that care exhibits a state of things that is consistent with the Trinitarian hypothesis, and no other. Holding the Catholic Faith, we believe that the Godhead existed from all eternity as the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The worlds that people space may have been created millions of ages previously to our own. And each may have had its revelation of the Divine Creator, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But antecedently to all, when God alone existed, we believe that the Father from all eternity was Father, the Divine Logos was coexistent, and the Spirit of both Father and Son was as eternally the Holy Ghost. In due course of time, therefore, the kingdom of grace, so far as our world is concerned, began, and the administration of that kingdom harmonises alone with the doctrine of the Trinity. Man was created in the image of God, but by sin he forfeited that glorious condition of his innocence. We cannot imagine that evil had a superior power to mar the plan of the Almighty, or that it was an accidental interruption unforeseen in the eternal counsels. The

is Faith in
Unity.

¹ 'Deum nos a prophetis, et a Christo, non a philosophis, nec ab Epicuro erudimur; qui credimus Deum etiam in terris egisse, et humani habitus humilitatem suscepisse,

ex causa humanæ salutis, longe sumus a sententia illorum, qui nolunt Deum curare quidquam.' Tertull. *adv. Marc.* 11. 16.

Evil over-
ruled for
good.

revealed Word assures us of the mode whereby we may recover a higher and more glorious estate in Christ, than was forfeited in Adam. This is the true answer to questions concerning the origin of evil, that otherwise are so perplexing to the human mind. Evil would seem to have been permitted by the All-wise Ruler of the universe, that its remedy might bring the Church of redeemed souls into closer union with His own Eternal Being in heaven, than ever could have been attained in the most blessed earthly paradise. And the predestined counsel of Love was effected by the Divine Being, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; that is, by God, as He ever was and is and is to be. Apart from this functional inter-relation the Personal Unity of the Deity would be consistent only with either the hypothesis of Epicurus¹, or with the pantheistic notion, that the Deity pervades every portion of creation, as the divine soul and entelechia of the whole, fancifully described by Tertullian; ‘²Deum sic per materiam decucurrisset, quomodo mel per favos;’ and if the Unitarian were to be limited to the strict and necessary inferences of his creed, it is hard to imagine how he could attain to any higher result than one or other of these two forms of Deism. But we know, in the Christian Church, that God, having created man in his own image, when that image for a time was obliterated, purposed to restore it once more; we are assured that

¹ ‘Quod si ita est, vere exposita illa sententia est ab Epicuro, quod æternum beatumque sit, id nec habere ipsum negotii quidquam, nec

exhibere alteri.’ Cic. *De Nat. De.* 1. 17.

² Tertull. *adv. Hermog.* XLIV.

it was decreed in counsels, predestined from everlasting, to bring the Church of souls redeemed in Christ to heaven, and to fill them, beyond all possibility of after loss or diminution, with an eternal weight of glory, such as it oppresses the soul even to endeavour to conceive. For this purpose God was made man, in order that man might be made one with God once more, and be rendered capable of that present union with Him, which should be as the forerunner and harbinger of God's all-pervading presence in eternity.

Man reconciled with God.

The Incarnation of the Son of God is the keystone of this union; 'as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.... And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.' It is at this point in detailing the work of grace, that accuracy of definition is more than ever needful. In speaking of the Son of God, we mean God. As surely as man inherits from his sire all the attributes of the flesh, so surely does the eternal Son inherit from the Father all the attributes of the Godhead—Power indeed, and Majesty, and Glory, but also Infinity, Eternity, and most Perfect Unity of Being. He is the express image of the Father, the Divine Word; and as the term *Λόγος*, humanly speaking, embraces the compound idea of outward expression or speech, and internal spirit or reason; so the divine *Λόγος* is the outward expression of the hidden counsels of God; the Allwise manifestation of the Allwise.

John xvii. 21, 23.

Imperfect
human
analogies.

Man indeed can only reveal the thoughts of his heart by word; but if we could imagine it possible that soul should perceive soul, and that the mind existing in any particular mental state or mode should be clearly discernible to other minds without outward material expression; however imperfect our idea of the relation of the Logos to the Almighty source of all Wisdom might still remain, one difficulty, interposed by gross bodily conceptions, would at least be removed, and we should appreciate more readily, by analogical reasoning, the eternal subsistence of the Logos in the bosom of the Father. The unity of man's intellect is in no way infringed by its existence at one time in a state of reflection, at another of hope or fear; and the unity of the Divine Nature also remains essentially unaltered, however the Divine Logos, the Perfect revelation of the Perfect, the express image of the Eternal, be from everlasting to everlasting one in the Divine Unity, and only by derived expression and generation distinct from the Father. One thing, however, must still be remembered, that as there can be no bodily idea in the notion of the Divine Word's subsistence, so also there is no intellectual parallel that can adequately express it. To illustrate the possibility of modal subsistence, without marring the strict unity and identity of substance, is all that the analogy of the human intellect can effect; but to explain the personal distinction of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, it is wholly incompetent.

The Word was made flesh. The eternal Son

took upon Him our nature ; but even so we were not yet reconciled. The Way, the Truth, and the Life was with us ; but we had no power to place ourselves in the Way, no heart for the Truth, no spiritual consciousness, which is the Life. The union, it is true, had been effected, in a general sense, between the Divine and Human nature ; but man was to be redeemed to God singly and individually, and that indwelling of God in Man, which was the result of an union of the two natures in Christ, must subsist in some proportionate degree in every child of God upon earth, as the pledge of his final state of glory, when the spirit and soul shall be wholly redeemed to God, and even the vile body changed, and be made like unto Christ's glorious body. To this end, a true spiritual communion, between each individual of the Church of the redeemed and the Father of all, was once more established through the Mediation of the Son. Christ died as the atonement for our sin ; but he rose again for our justification ; and from that time the Spirit of the Father and of the Son has been sacramentally united with the spirit of man, as the seal of his re-adoption into the family of God. The entire scheme therefore of redemption, as it has been revealed to us, is the harmonious result of that Unity of the Divine Perfections in a Trinity of Persons, that has subsisted from all eternity.

Man re-
deemed
singly.

And if analogical reasoning is of any assistance, in enabling us to realise the idea of diversity of subsistence in unity of substance, as regards the

 Wisdom

p. 631.

Father and the Son, we may carry it on another step, and say that the wisdom of a wise mind is one with the wisdom of thoughts and trains of reasoning, engendered by that Mind; and wisdom might with equal propriety be said to subsist in the Mind, and in the expressed thought, or to be revealed by the Mind, through the declared thought; hence the respective definitions of the Eastern and of the Western Church, with reference to the Procession of the Holy Spirit, equally satisfy the terms of a Catholic theology. Now it is Divine Substantive Wisdom, proceeding alike from Father and Son, in Majesty equal, in Glory co-eternal, that is declared to us, as the third object of our worship and adoration, God the Holy Ghost. But, here again it should be observed, that analogical reasoning only enables us partially to appreciate the truth; it is no demonstration of it; and in accepting this illustration of the Spirit's procession from the Father and the Son, we must not fail to remember, that if we cannot express the more familiar notion of the Filiation of the Son from God the Father, so neither can we declare the more subtle and recondite deduction, that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father and the Son. Sufficient is it for us to know, that Scripture teaches us to adore the Holy Ghost as God, and that, so far as it reaches, analogy harmonises with its teaching.

Now in the regeneration of man, it is this Divine Spirit that condescends to become sacramentally united with the spirit of man, and to re-

establish in his soul some present measure of the likeness of God, as an earnest of its complete restoration hereafter. It is the inspiration of this heavenly wisdom, that brings the spirit of man into accord with the will of God, and attunes it to the angels' song, 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill among men.' If therefore, by the condescension of the Divine Logos, a real union has been restored between the Divine and Human Natures, the work of sanctification in that holiness, which is the Will of God, is carried on by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit of the Father and the Son.

No other form of belief in God can consist with the gradual reclaiming, and finally *perfect* glorification of man. Without a Mediator there could be no mean of union between man and God. Unless the Holy Spirit of God conferred upon each individual severally his suitable measure of grace, leading him step by step towards the more perfect day, that *perfect* day never could be attained. Deism either leaves man as it finds him, or, confounding the effects of God's holy Spirit on the heart of man, with the workings of man's own spirit, it asserts the natural perfectibility of Man; acknowledging the results, but denying the agency, of Divine grace. Pantheism again, itself another name for Atheism, can give no better account of the good, that by the operation of the Spirit is visible in the world, than it does of the evil; and least of all can it appreciate the Divine Truth, revealed through Christ, that the victories of faith

and making
wise.

Recapitulating
clause.

are but the prelude to a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. It remains then, that taking the moral condition of man as it is by nature, and believing the teaching of the Word respecting his perfectibility after the image of God, it is necessary also that we believe in that manifestation of the Deity, which is the only pledge to us of our regeneration in the world of Grace. But holding this faith, the ultimate thought on which the soul reposes itself must still be the Unity of God.

The preceding clauses of the Creed are next summed up in one of those pointed doctrinal periods, that are so admirably characteristic of this composition, and that symbolise the constancy with which the Church held on her way in the most trying times, between the rocks and shoals of antagonising heresies. Being a recapitulation, the truths involved have already been explained.

19 *QUIA SICUT SINGILLATIM UNAMQUAMQUE PERSONAM ET DEUM ET DOMINUM CONFITERI CHRISTIANA VERITATE COMPELLIMUR; ITA TRES DEOS, AUT DOMINOS DICERE CATHOLICA RELIGIONE PROHIBEMUR.*

The three next members are closely connected together; and they serve to contrast the mode of subsistence of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. First, the substantive characters of the Deity are set down, that are common to all; and then there is superadded the relative property, that identifies the one Divine Person from the other.

20 *PATER A NULLO EST FACTUS, NEC CREATUS, NEC GENITUS.*

21 FILIUS A PATRE SOLO EST, NON FACTUS, NEC Personal definition.
CREATUS, SED GENITUS.

22 SPIRITUS SANCTUS A PATRE ET FILIO, NON
FACTUS, NEC CREATUS, NEC GENITUS EST, SED PRO-
CEDENS.

Of God alone it is true, that he is neither made nor created; then, to be begotten of none, marks the property of the Father; hence, He is often styled, God, in an absolute sense, for ‘¹Nihil sine origine nisi Deus solus.’ So the exposition of the Creed by Athanasius commences, ‘²Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα ἀγέννητον Θεόν, Πάτερα παντοκράτορα...τὸν ἔχοντα ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ τὸ εἶναι.’ So the source of all, the Godhead, is defined by Tertullian as ‘³Summum magnum, in æternitate constitutum, innatum, infectum, sine initio, sine fine.’ The Father is the deep, inscrutable, ineffable source of all good; and although the Son and Holy Spirit are coequal with Him, and coeternal, still theirs is a certain subordinate relation; for the Son derives his subsistence by an eternal generation from the Father; and the Holy Spirit proceeds forth, no less eternally, from the Father and the Son. The Father therefore is neither made, nor created, nor begotten. The Son is begotten of the Father; but otherwise the same two marks of self-existent substance are ascribed to him; and as the Father, so the Son is neither made nor created. The same three properties again, that distinguish the Father, are descriptive of

¹ Tertull. *adv. Marc.* v. 1.

Cath. i. 547.

² Athanas. *Expos. Symb. Vind.*

³ Tertull. *adv. Marc.* i. 3.

Catholic
doctrine.

the Spirit¹; He is neither made, nor created, nor begotten; but the diacritical property is then added, that discerns the subsistence of the third from that of the other two persons of the Trinity, and that property is Procession.

p. 567.

It has already been remarked, that if this exposition had been composed, after the word *Filioque* had been inserted in the Nicene Creed, by Churches of the Western communion, the writer of it would without doubt have defined the subsistence of the Holy Spirit, relatively to that of the Father and of the Son, as 'ab utroque procedens.' As the term now stands in the Creed, it would scarcely perhaps have given umbrage to the Greek conscience, prior to the division between the Eastern and Western branches of the Church Catholic; at least it states much less directly, that the Spirit proceeds from the Son, than the words, for instance, of Cyril of Alexandria; Πνεῦμα γὰρ ἀληθείας ὠνόμασται, καὶ ἔστι Χριστὸς ἡ ἀλήθεια· καὶ προχεῖται παρ' αὐτοῦ, καθάπερ ἀμέλει καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς². This also would almost seem to follow, by way of necessary consequence; that if the Creed had been written subsequently to the appearance of the Books *de Trinitate*, it would have contained the same expression of doctrine, in

¹ 'Cum autem factus non docetur Spiritus Sanctus, utique nec inter omnia probari potest, qui neque factus est sicut omnia, nec creatus.' Ambros. *de Sp. S.* i. 28. See also 91, 112, and ii. 42. In speaking of the procession of the

Holy Spirit, Greek and early Latin writers more frequently declare that He proceeds 'from God,' or 'from God and the Father,' than 'from the Father.'

² Cyr. Al. *Ep. Synod.* 9. *Vind. Cath.* i. 183.

this particular, with the teaching of Augustine, anterior to Augustine. who was always accused by partisans of the Greek doctrine of having given rise to the statement, that the Spirit proceeds from Father and Son. But the clear and sound expressions of Augustine did not originate with him. Such statements were preceded by the no less definite words of Ambrose : See p. 563, n. 2. ‘*Spiritus quoque Sanctus cum procedit a Patre et Filio, non separatur a Patre, non separatur a Filio*’¹. ‘*Non ergo quasi ex loco mittitur Spiritus, aut quasi ex loco procedit, quando procedit ex Filio*.’ The words of the Creed say little more than Hilary, ‘*Loqui autem de eo non necesse est, qui Patre et Filio auctoribus confitendus est*’²; or Ambrose, in the work just quoted, ‘*Et si Spiritum dicas, et Deum Patrem, a quo procedit Spiritus, et Filium, quia Filii quoque est Spiritus, nuncupasti*.’ Again : ‘*Dei Spiritus, et Spiritus Christi et in Patre est et in Filio, quia oris est Spiritus*.’

We are assisted then in settling the chronology of the Creed, by the mode of expression used with respect to the Spirit, that he is of the Father and the Son, qua origination, while that origination is manifested relatively by ‘Procession;’ it being neither stated in Latin phrase that he proceeds from Father and Son, nor, according to the Greek terminology, ἐκ Πάτρως διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ. Indeed there is no essential difference between the words of the Creed, and the statement of Basil in speaking of

¹ Ambros. *de Sp. S.* i. 11, 114, 37; iii. 6.

² Hilar. *de Trin.* ii. 29. *Vind. Cath.* i. 29.

Ancient
gloss.

the Holy Spirit; ¹ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι λέγεται, οὐχ ὡς τὰ παντὰ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ προελθόν' οὐ γεννητῶς ὡς ὁ Υἱός, ἀλλ' ὡς Πνεῦμα στόματος αὐτοῦ.

The Ambrosian MS. inserts an explanatory term, originally perhaps a gloss upon the word *procedens*; that it might not be imagined therefore, that procession involves subsequence in point of time, there is added the sentence, 'Patri et Filio coæternus est.' The words however interfere with the regular progression of theological statement, and were perhaps taken in from the margin.

In the next place, since a clear and separate definition has now been given of each separate person of the Holy Trinity, it follows that each stands distinct in his own hypostatic subsistence². No personal quality peculiar to the Father is possessed in common with the Son or with the Holy Ghost. The Father begets, himself being unbegotten. No definition of the relative condition of Filiation, that marks the personal subordination of the Son, can by any possibility apply to the Father, of whom he is the Only-begotten Son. And although the Son proceeds from the Father by generation, this ap-

¹ Bas. *de Sp. S.* 46. *Vind. Cath.* i. 396.

² 'Habeat necesse est Pater filium, ut pater sit; et Filius patrem, ut filius sit. Aliud est autem habere, aliud esse.' Tertull. *adv. Prax.* x.

The words of Tertullian were suggestive perhaps of the similar expressions of Ambrose.

'Solut Pater, quia unus Deus;

solut Pater, quia sola divinitas Pater et Filii et Spiritus Sancti; et quod unum est, solum est. Solut Pater, solus Unigenitus, solus et Spiritus Sanctus; neque enim qui Filius, et Pater; aut qui Pater, et Filius, aut qui Spiritus Sanctus et Filius. Alius Pater, alius Filius, alius Spiritus Sanctus.' Ambros. *in Luc. Lib.* ii. 12.

plies not to the Holy Spirit; unity of Procession from two Persons in the Divine Substance, makes him wholly one with them; therefore also the Personal Subsistence of the Holy Ghost is peculiar to the Third Person in the Holy Trinity, and to Him alone; He proceeds from the Father and the Son; but that Procession, like the generation of the Son, is from everlasting. Lastly, as the substance of the Deity is eternal, so is the trinary condition of hypostatic relation.

Sabellian-
ism.

23 UNUS ERGO PATER NON TRES PATRES; UNUS FILIUS NON TRES FILII; UNUS SPIRITUS SANCTUS, NON TRES SPIRITUS SANCTI¹.

These words mark the conclusion to be drawn from the foregoing definition. The peculiar hypostatic relation of each person to the others, constitutes the individual unity of that personal subsistence. The denial of this hypostatic distinction is Sabellianism; and the most ancient parallel to the clause will be found in certain expressions, used by writers against Patripassian and Sabellian error.

¹ 'Sicut unus Pater.....et sicut unus Filius.....ita etiam Spiritus Sanctus unus est.' Ambros. *de Sp.* S. i. 48. See also i. 307.

'Unus enim Deus Pater.....Unus natus ex Patre Dominus Jesus, et ideo Unigenitus. Unus et Spiritus Sanctus.' Ambros. *de Fide*, iv. 92.

'Divino itaque admirandoque mysterio manentem semper accipimus Patrem, semper Filium, semper Spiritum Sanctum, non duos Patres, non duos Filios, non duos Spiritus. Unus enim Deus Pater, ex quo omnia, et nos in ipso; et unus Dominus Jesus, per quem om-

nia, et nos per ipsum. Unus natus ex Patre Dominus Jesus, et ideo Unigenitus. Unus et Spiritus Sanctus, ut idem Apostolus dixit (1 Cor. xii. 11). Sic accipimus, sic legimus, sic tenemus. Distinctionem scimus, secreta nescimus; causas non discutimus, sacramenta servamus.' Id. *de Fide*, iv. 92.

Basil synchronises, using very similar terms: ὡς γὰρ εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ εἰς Υἱόν, οὕτω καὶ ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ..... Πατρί δὲ καὶ Υἱῷ κατὰ τοσοῦτον ἡνωταί, καθόσον ἔχει μονὰς πρὸς μονάδα τὴν οὐκείωτητα. *De Sp.* S. 45. *Vind. Cath.* i. 396.

Via media. e.g. Tertullian expresses its sense so far as the Father and Son are concerned: 'Negant enim Patrem, dum eundem Filium dicunt, et negant Filium, dum eundem Patrem credunt; dando illis quæ non sunt, auferendo quæ sunt.' His words are followed also by Hilary in speaking of Sabellianism; 'Patrem negando, dum Filio quod est Filius adimunt; Spiritum Sanctum negando, dum et usum et auctorem ejus ignorant¹.' 'Audiant unum ingenitum Deum Patrem, et suum unigenitum Dei Filium, perfecti Patris perfectam progeniem².' Eusebius, in his celebrated letter from Nice to the Church at Cæsarea, bears in the same way upon the Sabellian heresy: *τούτων ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ ὑπάρχειν πιστεύοντες, Πατέρα ἀληθῶς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν ἀληθῶς Υἱόν, καὶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἀληθῶς Πνεῦμα ἅγιον*. Athanasius also: *οὔτε γὰρ Υἱοπάτορα φρονούμεν, ὡς οἱ Σαβέλλιοι, λέγοντες μονοούσιον καὶ οὐχ ὁμοούσιον, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἀναιροῦντες τὸ εἶναι Υἱόν³*.

The words of Cyril of Jerusalem may be worthy of notice, as pursuing the same middle path with the Creed, between opposing heresies. 'The Son therefore is very God, having in Himself the Father, but not Himself becoming the Father; for it was not the Father but the Son who put on Man; let the truth have a free course. It was not the Father who suffered for us, but the Father sent Him who suffered for us. Neither saying, "There was a time when the Son was not," nor avowing identity

¹ Hil. *de Trin.* 11. 4. *Vind. Cath.* 1. 17. *Ibid.* 24. p. 26.

² Euseb. *Ep. ibid.* 540.

³ Athanas. *de Symb.* 2. *Vind. Cath.* 1. 548.

of Son and Father, but walking in the royal way, let us not deviate from it to the right hand or to the left. With the idea of honouring the Son, let us not address Him as Father. Neither, thinking to honour the Father, let us invidiously imagine the Son to be among created beings. But let the one Father be worshipped through the one Son, and let not the act of adoration be divided. Let one Son be proclaimed, seated at the right hand of the Father before the worlds; not having obtained a share of that throne by advancement after his Passion, but from all eternity¹. 'Neither hath he that begot become Son, nor hath he that is begotten become Father. Of one only Father is the one only-begotten Son. There are neither two unbegotten, nor two Only-begotten; but the unbegotten Father is one,.....and the Son is one, eternally begotten of the Father².' Fortunatus evidently regards the clause as having this direct

Cyril of
Jerusalem.

¹ Θεός τοίνυν αληθινός Υἱός, ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν Πατέρα, οὐκ εἰς Πατέρα μεταβληθείς· οὐ γὰρ Πατὴρ ἐννηνθρώπησεν, ἀλλὰ Υἱός· λεγέσθω γὰρ ἐλευθερίως ἡ ἀλήθεια. οὐ Πατὴρ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ Πατὴρ ἀπέστειλε τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν παθόντα. μήτε λέγωμεν ποτὲ τὸ, "Ὦν, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ Υἱός· μήτε υἱοπατορίαν καταδεξώμεθα. ἀλλ' ὁδῶ βασιλικῇ πορευθῶμεν, μὴ ἐκκλίνωμεν μήτε ἀριστερᾷ, μήτε δεξιᾷ. μήτε, διὰ τὸ νομίζειν τιμᾶν τὸν Υἱόν, Πατέρα αὐτὸν ἀναγορεύσωμεν· μήτε, διὰ τὸ τιμᾶν τὸν Πατέρα νομίζειν, ἔν τι τῶν δημιουργημάτων τὸν Υἱόν ὑποπτεύσωμεν. Ἄλλ' εἰς Πατὴρ, δι' ἐνός Υἱοῦ προσκυνέσθω, καὶ μὴ μερι-

ζέσθω ἢ προσκύνῃσις. εἰς Υἱὸς καταγγελλέσθω, πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς καθεζόμενος· τὸ συγκαθεζεσθαι, οὐ χρόνοις μετὰ τὸ πάθος λαβὼν ἐκ προκοπῆς, ἀλλ' αἰδίως κекτημένος. Cyr. Hieros. *Catech.* xi. 17. *Vind. Cath.* i. 120.

² οὔτε ὁ γεννήσας εἰς Υἱὸν μετεβλήθη, οὔτε ὁ γεννηθεὶς Πατὴρ ἐγένετο. Ἐξ ἐνός μόνου Πατρὸς, εἰς μονογενῆς Υἱός. οὔτε δύο ἀγέννητοι, οὔτε δύο μονογενεῖς· ἀλλ' εἰς ἐστὶ Πατὴρ ἀγέννητος, (ἀγέννητος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ Πατέρα μὴ ἔχων.) καὶ εἰς ἐστὶν Υἱός, αἰδίως ἐκ Πατρὸς γεγεννημένος· οὐ χρόνοις γεγεννημένος, ἀλλὰ πρὸ αἰώνων γεννηθείς. *Ibid.* 13.

Sabellius. bearing upon Sabellianism; “Unus ergo Pater, non tres Patres;” id est, quia Pater semper pater, nec aliquando Filius. “Unus Filius, non tres Filii;” id est, quia Filius semper filius, nec aliquando Pater. “Unus Spiritus Sanctus, non tres Spiritus Sancti;” id est, quia Spiritus Sanctus semper est Spiritus Sanctus, nec aliquando Filius, aut Pater. *Hæc est proprietas personarum.*’

The next verse, consistently with this, exhibits the negation of the antagonising heresy, and the Sabellian form of error having been refuted, reaction into Arianism is guarded against. In the case of the Being of the Father, the Arian said with the Church οὐδέποτε ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν’ but in expressing the Being of the Son, difference of substance was heretically marked by the exactly opposite formula¹, ἦν πότε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν. The substance of the Holy Spirit, in the same manner, was distinguished by the Macedonian or Semi-Arian party from the substance of the Son, as a subsequent act of creation; opinions that are very clearly pointed out in the words;

24 ET IN HAC TRINITATE NIHIL PRIUS AUT POS-

¹ So the Nicene Council expresses the diacritical test of Arianism in the anathema: τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, ἢ οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῆναι, ἢ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοὺτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησία. *Vind. Cath.* i. 542. So also in the Synodal epistle to the

Alexandrian Church: καὶ παμφηφεί ἐδοξεν ἀναθεματισθῆναι τὴν ἀσεβῆ αὐτοῦ δόξαν, καὶ τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τὰ βλάσφημα, οἷς ἐκέχρητο βλασφημῶν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγων ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, καὶ εἶναι ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν’ καὶ αὐτέξουσιότητι κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς δεκτικὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγοντος’ καὶ κτίσμα καὶ ποίημα ὀνομάζοντος, ἅπαντα ἀναθεμάτισεν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος. *Vind. Cath.* iii. 12.

TERIUS, NIHIL MAJUS AUT MINUS, SED TOTÆ TRES PERSONÆ COÆTERNÆ SIBI SUNT, ET COÆQUALES. Arius.

To exhibit fully the connexion between these words and Arian opinions, would be to quote from all the numerous treatises that were called forth in condemnation of this pestilent sect in the fourth century. Long however before the rise of Arianism, in the middle of the third century, the sagacity of Gregory Thaumaturgus foresaw the inevitable reaction of heretically disposed minds from Sabellianism to its opposite; for he subjoined to his Creed a compendium of doctrine, that would almost seem to have suggested the anathema appended to their Symbol by the Nicene Council. Certainly the writer of these last sentences must have been wholly free from the taint of Sabellianism, from which Basil¹, in the next century, considered it necessary to vindicate the memory of the venerable bishop of Neo-Cæsarea. At a still earlier date, Tertullian almost supplies the words of this article, as Bishop Kaye has observed; ‘Neutrum dicimus altero esse minorem, sive majorem; neutrum altero humiliorem sive superiorem².’ The wording of this portion, at least, of the Creed need not be sought in the pages of Augustine, with so clear a primitive testimony. There are terms also of Ambrose that may have occurred to the author; ‘Recordare quid responderis, quod credas in Patrem, credas in Filium, credas in Spiritum sanctum. Non habes illic: Credo in majorem et minorem et ultimum: sed eadem vocis tuæ cautione constringeris, ut similiter

¹ Bas. *Ep.* ccxx. 5.

² *Adv. Hermog.* 7.

Apollina-
ris.

credas in Filium, sicut in Patrem credis: similiter in Spiritum sanctum credas, sicut credis in Filium¹. Again, 'Nec ideo minus habet Filius, quia Pater non est; nec Pater minus habet, quia Filius non est².' Other similar passages are given below in the notes. Apollinaris taught that the Trinity was ἐκ μεγάλου καὶ μείζονος καὶ μεγίστου. (Greg. Naz. *Ep. i. ad Cledon.*) We may therefore consider that the words of the Creed had in view this, as well as the Arian heresy.

25 ITA UT PER OMNIA, SICUT JAM SUPRA DICTUM EST, ET UNITAS IN TRINITATE, ET TRINITAS IN UNITATE VENERANDA SIT.

26 QUI VULT ERGO SALVUS ESSE, ITA DE TRINITATE SENTIAT.

27 SED NECESSARIUM EST AD ÆTERNAM SALUTEM, UT INCARNATIONEM QUOQUE DOMINI NOSTRI JESU CHRISTI FIDELITER CREDAT.

¹ Ambros. *de Myst.* 5. *Vind. Cath.* III. 261.

² Ambros. *de Fide*, IV. 91. See also I. 68.

'Et revera quomodo majorem habet, qui Divinitate cum Patre unum est? Quod enim unum est, dissimile non est; inter majorem autem minoremque discretio est. Ergo de Filio et Patre præsentis docet lectionis exemplum, quia nec Pater minorem habet, nec majorem Dei Filius; cum in Patre et Filio nulla distantia Divinitatis sit, sed una majestas.' Ambros. *de Fide*, II. 73. cf. I. 68.

'Increata et inæstimabilis Trinitas, quæ unius est æternitatis et gloriæ, nec tempus nec gradum vel posterioris recipit vel prioris.' *Ibid.*

IV. 147.

'Denique ne vel in tempore, vel in ordine aliquam inter Patrem et Filium putares operis esse distantiam.....Non ergo alicui prior vel secundus est actus, sed idem unius operationis effectus.' Id. *de Sp. S.* II. 135.

'Primus est Filius, et ideo co-æternus; habet enim Patrem cum quo sit æternus.....Primus est Filius, et solus non est; quia cum Patre semper; solus non est; quia sine Patre nunquam est.' Id. *in Luc.* II. § 12.

'Et si ideo putatis Patrem majorem esse, quia genitus non est, numquid et Spiritus Sanctus major est Filio.' *De Inc. Dom. Sacr.* § 93.

The latter member of the Athanasian Creed remains to be investigated, referring to the Incarnation of Christ, both God and Man; detailing also the historical facts of His meritorious Cross and Passion, His Precious Death and Burial, His Glorious Resurrection and Ascension; and concluding with the sure evangelical truth, that He shall come again to judge both the quick and the dead. With respect to the necessity for a right faith in the Incarnation, the reader is referred back to former observations. The Son of God.
pp. 585—590.
 The mystery also of the Incarnation, the name Jesus, the appellation Christ, and the title Lord, have all received such explanatory remarks as seemed to be requisite; we may pass on therefore to the words,

28 EST ERGO FIDES RECTA, UT CREDAMUS ET CONFITEAMUR, QUOD DOMINUS NOSTER JESUS CHRISTUS, DEI FILIUS, DEUS PARITER ET HOMO EST.

As regards the words *Dei Filius*, it is unnecessary to do more than refer to the notes on the sixteenth verse. The Son of God is God, eternally one with the Father; and receiving by generation every identical perfection and attribute of the Deity, the very Deity, indivisible unity of nature marks the being as of the Father, so of the Son. The Father was never without the Son, even as the Son was never non-existent in the Godhead. God the Son, the eternal Word, for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was Incarnate; and whereas before He had existed 'in the mere glory of the Son of God,' the unfathomable mystery was revealed, that, from the Fall of Man,

Hooker.

640 GOD OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE FATHER.

The Theo-
phania.

Heb. ii. 10.

had been hidden in dark prophetic sayings, and traditional aspirations; God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, that He might give rise to a better hope than that which Adam lost; in order that by a true union between God and Man He might 'bring many sons to glory.'

29 DEUS EST EX SUBSTANTIA PATRIS ANTE
SÆCULA GENITUS; HOMO EX SUBSTANTIA MATRIS IN
SÆCULO NATUS¹.

Christ is God of the substance of the Father, before time or matter were created, that is, eternally. He is Man of the substance of his mother, born in the world. From the first rudimental formation of the human nature of Christ, the Godhead has never been separated from it; but as in death and in the tomb, the Godhead remained inseparably conjoined with the Manhood, so also from the time of the angelic annunciation made to the Blessed Mother of Jesus, to the birth of her firstborn in Bethlehem, the Divine and human natures were united, and in due course of time revealed to angels and shepherds, to the lineage of

¹ 'Nunc glorificatus est Filius Hominis, et Deus glorificatus est in illo. Quis Deus? utique non Pater, sed Sermo Patris, qui erat in Filio Hominis; id est in carne, in qua glorificatus jam; Virtute vero et Sermone, et ante Jesum. Tertull. *adv. Prax.* 23.

'Quod Deitatis est, caro non minuit; quod carnis est, Deitas non peremit. Idem enim et sempiternus ex Patre, et temporalis ex matre, in sua virtute inviolabilis, in nostra infirmitate passibilis. In

Deitate tantum, et cum Patre et cum Spiritu Sancto unius ejusdemque naturæ; in susceptione autem hominis, non unius substantiæ, sed unius ejusdemque personæ.' Id. *ad Hieron.* ed. Paris. 1842. viii. 168.

'Patres nostri non carnem, sed Dei Verbum unius substantiæ cum Patre esse dixerunt; et Verbum quidem ex paterna processisse substantia, carnem autem ex Virgine esse confessi sunt.' Ambros. *de Inc.* 52. cf. 113.

David, and to the adoring Magi; to the Church of Israel, and to the whole world, as Jesus, the one Christ, Emmanuel, God with us. Ambrose in
Theodoret.

The words of the Creed may be recognised in those of Ambrose¹. 'Non alter Christus sed unus est; et ante sæcula ex Patre, ut Dei Filius natus; et in sæculo, ut Homo, carnis assumptione generatus.' There is an extract also quoted by Theodoret from the works of Ambrose, that is to the full as like the words of the Creed, as any statements of Augustine. It is upon this account worthy of a close collation. '²We confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, was begotten of the Father before the worlds, as regards his Godhead without beginning; but that the same, in these latter days, was incarnate of the Holy Virgin Mary; that he took upon him perfect man, of reasonable soul and body; so that touching the Godhead, he is consubstantial with the Father, and touching the Manhood, He is consubstantial with us. For the two natures have been ineffably united. Wherefore we confess faith in one Christ, and one Son, our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God; knowing, that, whereas he is coæternal with the Father

¹ Ambros. *de Sp. S.* III. 170.

² 'Ὁμολογοῦμεν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, πρὸ πάντων μὲν τῶν αἰώνων ἀνάρχως ἐκ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἑσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκ τῆς ἀγίας παρθένου Μαρίας τὸν αὐτὸν σαρκαθέντα, καὶ τέλειον τὸν ἀνθρώπου ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος

ἀνειληφότα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα. δύο γὰρ φύσεων τελείων ἕνωσις γεγένηται ἀφράστως. διὸ ἓνα Χριστόν, ἓνα Υἱόν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱόν τοῦ Θεοῦ καθομολογοῦμεν, εἰδότες ὅτι περ αἰδίου ὑπάρχων τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καθ' ἣν καὶ

Ambrose in
Theodoret.

as touching the Godhead, whereby he is Creator also of the universe, he condescended...ineffably to build up a temple of the Virgin, and to make it one with himself from the very conception; taking and making one with himself a body, not coæternal of his own substance, and brought down from heaven, but of our material substance, that is, of the Virgin. It was not that the Word of God was converted into Flesh, or appeared spectrally; but preserving his own substance, without change or alteration, he made one with himself the first rudimental germ of our nature that was assumed. God the Word, with infinite goodness, condescended to make one with himself the first elements of our nature; not as though he owed his origin to the Virgin, but as existing coæternally with the Father; not by commixture, but by revealing himself as one and the same Person in both substances.'

There is no doctrine in theology that is so concisely, and therefore so forcibly expressed, as this mystery of the Incarnation has been declared, from ancient days, by the word Θεοτόκος. The term is first observed in the epistle from Alexander¹,

πάντων ὑπάρχει δημιουργός, ἡξίωσε
μετὰ τὴν συγκατάθεσιν τῆς ἀγίας
παρθένου, ἀπορρήτως ἐαυτῷ ἐξ
αὐτῆς οἰκοδομῆσαι ναὸν, καὶ τοῦτον
ἐνώσαι ἐαυτῷ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς συλλή-
ψεως, οὐ συναΐδιον ἐκ τῆς ἐαυτοῦ
οὐσίας οὐρανὸθεν ἐπιφερόμενον σώ-
μα, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ φυράματος τῆς
ἡμετέρας οὐσίας, τούτεστιν ἐκ τῆς
παρθένου, τοῦτο εἰληφώς, καὶ ἐαυ-
τῷ ἐνώσας. Οὐχ ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος εἰς
σάρκα τραπεῖς, οὔτε μὴν φάντασμα
φανείς· ἀλλ' ἀτρέπτως, καὶ ἀναλ-

λοιώτως τὴν ἐαυτοῦ διατηρῶν οὐ-
σίαν, τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τῆς φύσεως τῆς
ἡμετέρας εἰληφώς, ἐαυτῷ ἦνωσεν·
οὐκ ἀρχὴν ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος ἐκ τῆς
παρθένου εἰληφώς, ἀλλὰ συναΐδιος
τῷ ἐαυτοῦ Πατρὶ ὑπάρχων, τὴν
τῆς φύσεως τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀπαρχὴν
ἐαυτῷ, διὰ πολλὴν ἀγαθότητα, ἐ-
νώσαι κατηξιώσεν· οὐ κραθεῖς, ἀλλ'
ἐν ἐκατέραις ταῖς οὐσίαις εἰς καὶ ὁ
αὐτὸς φανείς. Theodoret. *Dial.* 11.
Πολύμορφ.

¹ Theodoret. *H. E.* I. 4. A.D. 324.

Bishop of Alexandria, to his namesake of Constantinople, in the year that preceded the Nicene Council. But even here the word occurs in a discursive exposition of the Faith; so as to leave the impression on the mind, that it may not have been first devised by Alexander, but that it may have descended to him from a former generation with the Creed itself, of which it formed a part. He says that Christ was the Firstfruits of the Resurrection, *σῶμα φορέσας ἀληθῶς καὶ οὐ δοκήσει, ἐκ τῆς θεοτόκου Μαρίας*, that he was crucified and died, but without separation of the Divine Nature; that he rose from the dead, was received into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of Majesty. This letter, it will be observed, was written more than a century before the appearance of Nestorius. Forty years later¹, Julian the Apostate, in his work against the Christian religion, recorded the fact, that the Virgin was very generally named by Christians, the mother of God; and again, in ten years from this last date, Athanasius uses the term as one altogether familiar to Catholic ears. It would be a great error therefore to suppose that the word *Θεοτόκος* was first applied in defining the Incarnation at the Council of Ephesus. The venerable synod only adopted into their confession of faith a term, that had descended to them by an immemorial tradition; and the existence of this word in primitive theology, is a clear indication of the sense attached by the Church, from the earliest

¹ Cyril. *Al. c. Jul.* VIII. p. 262. B. D. p. 276. E.

Primitive
doctrine.

days, to the statements of Scripture referring to the Incarnation.

30 PERFECTUS DEUS, PERFECTUS HOMO, EX ANIMA RATIONALI ET HUMANA CARNE SUBSISTENS.

Perfect God, therefore, and perfect man, Christ was born into the world. The Divine Word, that had existed from all eternity in the bosom of the Father, was the Godhead; the child Jesus, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting, was the seed of Abraham; and the two natures together, in one person, formed Christ the second Adam; no longer made *after* the likeness of God, but the very brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person. Ignatius says, 'For our God, Jesus Christ, was born in the womb by Mary, according to the dispensation of God, of the seed indeed of David, but of the Holy Ghost; who was born and was baptized,' &c. And in a preceding passage of the same epistle; 'We have one physician, both fleshly and spiritual, begotten and unbegotten; in the flesh, God; in death, the true life; being both of Mary and of God; in the one respect impassible, in the other susceptible of suffering.' But these passages are not read in the Syriac Epistle.

This statement of doctrine leads us on from the heresies of Sabellius and Arius to the after

¹ Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκνοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας κατ' οἰκονομίαν Θεοῦ, ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαβὶδ, Πνεύματος δὲ Ἁγίου· ὃς ἐγεννήθη, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη, κ.τ.λ. Ignat. ad Eph. 18. Vind. Cath. III. 464.

² Εἰς ἱατρός ἐστιν σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός, γέννητος καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν σάρκι γενόμενος Θεός, ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή, καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ, πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής. c. 7.

development of Arianism, known as the Apollinarian heresy. Hitherto the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity had been the stronghold assailed by hostile attacks from the most opposite quarters. The latter half of the fourth century witnessed the rise and fall of the Apollinarian heresy; or rather, like a conflagration smothered and subdued for a time, the heresy lay smouldering, to burst out again as Eutychianism, and to reappear once more in the Monothelitic notions of the seventh century. The union of the two natures in Christ was now called in question; and the doctrine of the Incarnation was subjected to the same rigid scrutiny and heretical cavillings, that had already traced out, as with a sunbeam, the faith of the Church, with respect to the doctrine of the Trinity. The same confusion of ideas also, that lay at the root of every previous heresy, led Apollinaris into error; and just as the Docetic, early Gnostic, Sabellian and Arian heresies had erred in opposite directions, from inability to perceive that unity of person might consist with plurality of substance, and *vice versa*, that unity of substance might include plurality of persons, so Apollinaris erred; he believed, because the person of Christ was one, therefore that his nature must be one; and he asserted that the uncreate body of Christ was intimately commingled with the Divine Logos in such a way that the two distinct natures formed one heterogeneous substance, entirely *sui generis*; that this heavenly body was born into the world of the Virgin Mary; but that of human intellect, and human will there was none; the

The
Apollina-
rian heresy.

Athana-
sius.

functions of mind and soul being discharged by the Logos. Since frequent reference must now be made to this heresy, it will be as well to bear in mind the accurate definition of Apollinarian tenets that has been recorded by Athanasius.

‘¹But these heretics either fancy a conversion of the Word, or suppose the dispensation of the Passion to be unreal; at one time affirming the flesh of Christ to be uncreate and heavenly; at another, that it is even consubstantial with the Godhead. Then they say, that in lieu of our human intellect there was a heavenly mind in Christ, and that he made use of the form with which he was invested, as of an organized body; but that it was impossible it should have been perfect Man; for where there is perfect man there is also sin; and that two perfect natures never could make one².’

Ambrose says the same thing, but in terms that are nearer to those employed by the framer of the Creed; ‘³Do we also infer division, when we affirm that he took upon him a reasonable soul, and one endowed with intellectual capacity? For God

¹ Οὗτοι δὲ, ἡ ἀλλοίωσιν τοῦ Λόγου φαντάζονται, ἢ δόκησιν τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πάθους ὑπολαμβάνουσιν. Ποτὲ μὲν ἀκτιστον καὶ ἐπουράνιον λέγοντες τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σάρκα, ποτὲ δὲ, ὁμοούσιον τῆς θεότητος, εἰπά φασιν, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔσωθεν ἐν ἡμῖν ἀνθρώπου, νοῦς ἐπουράνιος ἐν Χριστῷ. Ὡς γὰρ ὁργανικῶ κέχρηται σχήματι τῷ περιέχοντι· οὐ γὰρ οἶόν τε ἡν τέλειον ἀνθρώπον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι. ὅπου γὰρ τέλειος ἀνθρώπος, ἐκεῖ καὶ ἁμαρτία, καὶ

ὅτι δύο, τέλεια ἐν γενέσθαι οὐ δύναται. Athanas. *de Inc.* i. 2. *Vind. Cath.* i. 140.

² Apollinaris is said by Athanasius to have derived this notion of the essential and necessary sinfulness of the flesh from Manichæus. *Ath. de Inc.* i. 12; ii. 3. *Vind. Cath.* i. 156, 262.

³ ‘Numquid etiam cum dicimus quia animam rationabilem et intellectus nostri suscepit capacem, dividimus eum? Non enim ipse Deus

himself, the Word, was not to the flesh as the reasonable intellectual soul; but God the Word, taking upon him a reasonable intellectual soul, human, and of the same substance with our souls, the flesh also like our own, and of the same substance with that of which our flesh is formed, was also perfect Man, but without any taint of sin... Wherefore his flesh and his soul were of the same substance with our soul and our flesh.' It will be seen that Chrysostom describes the heresy in very similar terms, in a passage quoted below upon the 32nd p. 660. verse.

The Creed, then, has a very definite bearing upon these heretical notions; and it goes to the root of the matter, when it says that Christ is 'Perfect God and perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.' He is perfect God, the Divine Nature remaining perfectly distinct from the Human; for the union of the two in one Christ was effected by no mixture of the two, or *συναλοιφή*, whereby, of two separate natures, one binary mixed nature would be the result; as of two metals fused together, a third composite substance might be formed, having the combined characters of the two simple elements. In the same way He is perfect man; and invested with every attribute of perfect man; perfect, that is, as was

Verbum pro anima rationabili et intellectus capaci in carne sua fuit, sed animam rationabilem et intellectus capacem, et ipsam humanam, et ejusdem substantiæ, cujus nostræ sunt animæ, et carnem nostræ similem, ejusdemque cujus caro est

nostra substantiæ, suscipiens Deus Verbum, perfectus etiam Homo fuit, sine ulla tamen labe peccati..... Caro ergo ipsius et anima ejusdem cujus anima nostra caroque substantiæ est.' Ambros. *de Inc.* 76.

The second Adam, when God pronounced him to be very good; when the pure mirror of his soul, as yet unsullied by sin, reflected with no broken beam the holy image in which he was created. Such was the human nature of Christ, not only as regards the body, but in respect of the soul also. The body was of the seed of Abraham, and therefore human, like our own; the soul was endowed with intellect and reason; the heart with the kindly affection of perfect man; the will too was human, only it harmonised wholly with the will of God, as did the will of Adam before it was corrupted by sin.

It is remarkable that the same terms that Hippolytus found it necessary to use in condemnation of the Patripassian tenets of Noetus, express with considerable accuracy the refutation of Apollinarianism. 'As he was predicted, so also at his Advent he manifested himself, being made a new man of the Virgin and the Holy Ghost, having a heavenly nature from the Father, as the Word, but an earthly nature, as made flesh of the old Adam through the Virgin. He coming forth into the world, was made manifest in the body as God, coming forth as perfect man; for it was not in phantasy or by conversion, but in reality that he was made man.' Both Noetus and Apollinaris denied that the Word was made man of the Virgin.

¹ Καθ' ὃν οὖν τρόπον ἐκκρήχθη, κατὰ τοῦτον καὶ παρὼν ἐφανερώσεν ἑαυτὸν, ἐκ παρθένου καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος καινὸς ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος, τὸ μὲν οὐράνιον ἔχων τὸ πατρῶον ὡς Λόγος, τὸ δὲ ἐπίγειον ὡς ἐκ παλαιοῦ Ἀδάμ διὰ παρθένου

σαρκούμενος. Οὗτος προελθὼν εἰς κόσμον Θεὸς ἐν σώματι ἐφανερώθη, ἄνθρωπος τέλειος προελθὼν. οὐ γὰρ κατὰ φαντασίαν ἢ τροπὴν, ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος. Hippolyt. c. Noet. 17.

by the Holy Ghost; the earlier heretic as teaching that there was no real hypostatic distinction in the Deity, the later as supposing that the flesh, as an eternally uncreate body, came down from heaven. Both denied, for the same reason, the inseparable union of two perfect natures in one person; both denied that Christ was perfect man; the Patripassian¹, no less than the Apollinarian, having considered that the Divine Nature supplied the place of a human soul. In fact, this idea that the Word was to Christ, as the immaterial substance, the soul, is to man, was a very favourite notion with the most opposite factions of heresy. Apollinaris borrowed it from the Arians; for Athanasius declares, ‘² Arius believes the flesh to be a receptacle only for the Divinity; but he affirms that the Word was to the flesh in the stead of the inner man, the soul; recklessly ascribing to the Godhead susceptibility of suffering, and resurrection from the dead.’ Arius, in like manner, would seem to have borrowed it from the Sabellian heresy, however widely in other respects he may have differed. For in the council held at Alexandria under Athanasius and

Course of
Apollina-
rian error.

¹ So Hippolytus plainly indicates the opposite tenets of Noetus, when he defines the catholic faith: ὅτι Θεὸς Λόγος ἀπ’ οὐρανῶν κατήλθεν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον Μαρίαν, ἵνα σαρκωθείς ἐξ αὐτῆς, λαβὼν δὲ καὶ ψυχὴν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην, λογικὴν δὲ λέγω, γεγωνὴς πάντα ὅσα ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ἐκτὸς ἁμαρτίας, σῶσῃ τὸν πεπτωκότα, κ.τ.λ. Hippolyt. c. Noet. 17.

² Ἀρείος δὲ, σάρκα μόνην πρὸς ἀποκρυφὴν τῆς θεότητος ὁμολογεῖ.

ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ἔσθωθεν ἐν ἡμῖν ἀνθρώπου, τουτέστι τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸν Λόγον ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ λέγει γεγονέναι, τὴν τοῦ πάθους νόησιν, καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἧδου ἀνάστασιν τῇ θεότητι προσάγει τολμῶν. Athanas. c. Apoll. II. Vind. Cath. i. 262.

The heresy being placed by Athanasius in apposition with that of Sabellius, leaves no room to suspect that the name of Arius has been substituted in error for that of Apollinaris.

Course of
Apollina-
rian error.

Eusebius of Vercellæ, A.D. 362, the Catholic correlative doctrine was asserted in such a way as to imply, that at least the earlier form of Sabellianism included this defective notion of Christ's human nature¹. They appealed, therefore, to all the most venerable writers of the Church Catholic, as teaching that Christ had not only the body, but the soul of man; and added, that the same doctrine had been advanced by the council assembled at Philadelphia in Arabia, in correction of the Patripassian Beryllus; and declared by them in their synodal letter to that unsound bishop. Now Beryllus was certainly one of the precursors of Sabellianism; and if we find a synod of Catholic bishops remonstrating with him, for teaching that Christ had no true human soul, we need not be surprised to find, that Hippolytus should have argued with the contemporary Patripassian Noetus upon the same point, almost as Athanasius would have addressed an Apollinarian. It is also observable, that in writing against the still earlier Patripassian Praxeas, Tertullian² infers that, in other respects also, there was a close analogy between the opinions of that heretic and Apollinaris; while ³the care that he

¹ Καὶ τὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, οὐ μόνον ἑνσαρκον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐμψυχώμενον ἀπεφώνησαντο, ἧ καὶ πάλαι τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐδόκει.....οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ διὰ Βήρυλλον τὸν Φιλαδελφίας τῆς ἐν Ἀραβίᾳ ἐπίσκοπον γενομένη σύνοδος, γράφουσα Βηρύλλῳ τὰ αὐτὰ παραδέδωκεν, κ.τ.λ. Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* III. 7.

² 'Si enim Sermo ex transfigu-

ratione et demutatione substantiæ caro factus est, una jam erat substantia Jesus ex duabus, ex carne et spiritu mixtura quædam, ut electrum ex auro et argento; et incipit nec aurum esse, id est, spiritus, neque argentum, id est, caro, dum alterum altero mutatur, et tertium quid efficitur.' Tertull. *adv. Præx.* 27.

³ 'Sed hæc vox carnis et animæ,

takes to explain, that our Lord's exclamation on the Cross was the expression of the mortal agony of the soul, and not of the Divine Word, imply that Praxeas symbolised with Noetus and Beryllus; and that the three Patripassian precursors of Sabelianism, asserted that the Word fulfilled the functions of the human soul in Christ. If such be the case, we may trace this distinctive tenet of universal heresy, by an unbroken succession, from the ¹Doctetæ of the second century to the Monothelites of the seventh; and, so far, these heresies give an unwilling witness to the Divinity of Christ.

Course of
Apollina-
rian error.

Hence also we find that Tertullian expresses himself upon the subject of the distinct permanence of the two natures in the one person of Christ, with a closeness and accuracy scarcely inferior to the definitions of the Creed. 'Wherefore because the flesh is mortal, there is in Christ both Man and the Son of Man. Else, why is Christ styled Man and Son of Man, if there were in him nothing human, nothing derived from man? If indeed it

id est hominis, non Sermonis nec Spiritus, id est non Dei, propterea emissa est, ut impassibilem Deum ostenderet, qui sic Filium dereliquit, dum hominem ejus tradidit in mortem.' *Adv. Prax.* 30.

¹ Irenæus in the second century, as Athanasius in the fourth, found it necessary to state the perfect human nature of Christ both in body, and reasonable soul, 'Nos autem quoniam corpus sumus de terra acceptum, et anima accipiens de Deo Spiritum, omnis quicumque confitebitur. Hoc itaque factum est Verbum Dei, suum plasma in semet

ipsum recapitulans.' Iren. III. 32.

² 'Ideo quia mortalis hæc est, in Christo Homo et Filius Hominis. Aut cur homo Christus, et Filius Hominis, si nihil hominis et nihil ex homine? Nisi si aut aliud est homo quam caro, aut aliunde caro hominis, quam ex homine, aut aliud Maria, quam homo, Deus Marcionis aut [for. leg. aut homo Deus Marcionis]; aliter non diceretur Homo Christus sine carne, nec Hominis Filius sine aliquo parente homine; sicut nec Deus sine Spiritu Dei, nec Dei Filius sine Deo patre.' Tertull. *de carne Chr.* 5.

Tertullian. could be true that man should be any thing but flesh, or that the flesh of humanity should be of any thing but man, then either Mary might be something else than human, or the Marcionite God might be man; for in any other case Christ never could have been called man, without the flesh, nor the Son of Man, without any human parent; even as he could not be called God, without the Spirit of God, nor the Son of God, without God as his Father. In this way either substance having been taken into consideration, there is a manifestation of both Man and God; in the one respect he was born, in the other He was not born; in the one respect he was fleshly, in the other spiritual; on the one hand weak, on the other Almighty; for the one reason dying, but for the other living.' Again, '1 The Virgin conceived and brought forth Emmanuel, God with us. This was a new nativity, whereby man was born in God.' Again, '2 God condescends to be born of the womb of the Virgin, and fulfils the time, and when born he patiently grows up, and, as an adult, desires not to be recognised.' Again, '3 For the Word of Life was made flesh, and

1 'Concepit ergo Virgo et peperit Emmanuelem, Nobiscum Deum. Hæc est nativitas nova, dum homo nascitur in Deo.....Ad unam jam lineam congressionem dirigamus; an carnem Christus ex virgine acceperit, ut hoc præcipue modo humanam eam constet, si ex humana matrice substantiam traxit.' *De carne Chr.* 17.

2 'Nasci se Deus in utero patitur matris, et expectat, natus adolescere sustinet, et adultus non gestit

agnosci.' *De Pat.* 3.

'Quid enim indignius Deo? Quid magis erubescendum, nasci, an mori?' *De carne Chr.* 5. Marcion denied that the Son of God suffered; Tertullian's words shew that he believed Him to be incarnate of the Virgin Mary.

3 'Sermo enim vitæ caro factus, et auditus et visus et contrectatus, quia caro; qui ante carnem Sermo tantum, in primordio apud Deum Patrem, non Pater apud Sermonem.

was heard, and seen, and handled, as being flesh; who before the flesh was the Word only, in the beginning with God the Father, not the Father with the Word. For as the Word is God, so He is with God; because He is God of God, and as being together with the Father, He is with the Father.' From these extracts it is also evident, that the expression of faith in two perfect natures contained in the Creed is quite as likely to have been deduced, directly or otherwise, from the pages of Tertullian, as from the works of Augustine.

Subordina-
tion of the
Son.

31 ÆQUALIS PATRI SECUNDUM DIVINITATEM; MINOR PATRE SECUNDUM HUMANITATEM.

The words follow from the preceding by way of necessary consequence. Leo almost quoted them, when he wrote to Flavianus; 'De nostro enim illi est minor Patre Humanitas; de Patre illi est æqualis cum Patre Divinitas;' while the former part of the preceding verse may have suggested those other words in the same epistle; 'In integra ergo veri hominis, perfectaque natura, verus natus est Deus; totus in suis, totus in nostris.'

The Apollinarian cavil is next disposed of, that the Catholic faith, by denying a mixture of two natures in one person, taught that there were two persons in Christ. And wherever heresy has been convicted of falsifying doctrine in one point, it has usually retorted upon the Church a charge of fos-

Nam et si Deus Sermo, sed apud Deum; quia ex Deo Deus quia cum Patre, apud Patrem,' Tertull. *adv. Prax.* 15.

¹ Leo *ad Flav.* III. 4. *Vind. Cath.* I. 211. Compare Tertullian *adv. Prax.* 22.

Unity of
Person.

tering either the exactly opposite, or some collateral error. So the Gnostic party accused the Church of Christ of making God the author of evil; so the Docetæ, when the reality of Christ's sufferings was declared, exclaimed that the impassibility of the Deity was thereby impugned; so the Sabellian accused the Catholic of Polytheism, while the Arian declared him to be Sabellian. With the same degree of perversity, the Apollinarian charged the Church with Man-worship, and with dividing Christ, according to the two Natures, into two Persons, the Person of God, and the Person of Man. The Word indeed had a personal subsistence from all eternity, but the human nature of Christ never had any personal subsistence apart from the Son of God; the creation of the first rudimental germ of humanity, and its conjunction with the Person of the Word being simultaneous. Christ therefore is one; in the words of the Creed,

32 QUI LICET DEUS SIT ET HOMO, NON DUO
TAMEN, SED UNUS EST CHRISTUS.

Now it has already been observed, that if the Creed contained statements antidotal of Nestorianism, we might view the clause now before us as having a bearing upon that heresy, because it expresses a sufficiently accurate negation of the main error of Nestorius. A comparison of contemporary orthodox statement will make this clear. Cyril of Alexandria, for instance, fully exposes the errors condemned at Ephesus, both in his Synodal epistle with its excommunicatory clauses, and in his Epistle

to Nestorius. So he says, ‘¹We speak not of one Christ, *per se*, the Word of God, and again of another Christ, *per se*, born of a woman; but we acknowledge one Christ alone, the Word of God the Father, with his human nature.’ And the second of the twelve anathemas declares, ‘²If any affirm that the Word of God the Father is not made hypostatically one with the flesh; that Christ with his own flesh is not one; and that the same person, of a truth, is not at the same time God and Man, let him be anathema.’ So again the epistle to Nestorius, if any other, must be taken as a fair expression of the heresiarch’s opinions. We there read; ‘³The natures that meet together in a true unity are distinct, but of both is constituted one Christ and Son.....The One Lord Jesus Christ therefore is not to be divided into two Sons.’

It should be borne in mind, that Nestorius imagined two Sons, the one, the eternal Logos, the other, the child Jesus, with whom, at birth, the Logos was intimately joined; if, therefore, this clause in the Creed had been intended as a caution against Nestorianism, it would have had its proper place immediately after the words, ‘born in the

Nestorian
opinions.

¹ Οὐτε μὴν Χριστὸν ἰδικῶς ὀνομάζοντες τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγον, καὶ ὁμοίως ἰδικῶς Χριστὸν ἕτερον τὸν ἐκ γυναικός· ἀλλ’ ἓνα μόνον εἰδότες Χριστὸν, τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρός Λόγον μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκός. Cyr. Al. Ep. Synod. Vind. Cath. i. 182.

² Εἰ τις οὐχ ὁμολογῇ, σαρκὶ καθ’ ὑπόστασιν ἠνωσθαι τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρός Λόγον, ἓνα δὲ εἶναι Χριστὸν μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκός,

τὸν αὐτὸν δηλονότι Θεὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀνθρωπον· ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Ibid. 190.

³ Διάφοροι μὲν αἱ πρὸς ἐνότητα τὴν ἀληθινὴν συναρχεῖσθαι φύσεις, εἰς δὲ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων Χριστὸς καὶ Υἱός.....οὐ διαιρετέον τοιγαροῦν εἰς υἱοὺς δύο τὸν ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. Cyr. Al. Ep. Synod. III. 5. Ibid. 173. 175.

Post-Ephesine
theology.

world;’ and then it would have met the heresy much more directly, if the words had run, ‘Non duo tamen, sed unus *Filius* est Christus.’ Again, as the total absence of the term *θεοτόκος* marks the fact, that the Creed could not with any degree of probability have been written after the third general Council of Ephesus; so the gradually increasing use of the term, during the preceding part of this century, suggests cause for doubting whether it could have been written much after 400 A.D. After the Council of Ephesus, the theology of the age obtained as marked a character, as that of the preceding century exhibited, after the condemnation of Arius at Nice. It is scarcely possible to doubt the date of any doctrinal treatise written after the year 431. For instance, there is a treatise ascribed to Theodoret in Gallandius, to which the year 423 is assigned as the date¹; but erroneously. The opening alone is decisive upon that point, and it illustrates the shape which this clause would have taken after the condemnation of Nestorius. ‘Some have brought a false accusation against us, and have said that we divide the One Lord Jesus Christ into two Sons; but so far are we from imagining this, that we charge with impiety all who venture to make such an assertion.’ The treatise was manifestly written after the author’s misunderstanding with Cyril of Alexandria. We shall have occasion to revert to it in the sequel.

Further, the article now under review has no necessary bearing upon Nestorianism, because it

¹ Gallandii *Bibl. Patr.* ix. 412.

contains no other doctrinal statement, than had obtained currency among preceding ecclesiastical writers. The Creed affirms that although Christ is God and man, his personal subsistence is not twofold, but one. Now the fault found by the Apollinarian with the Catholic system, was exactly this; that by denying the commixture of two natures in Christ, it avowed two persons in Christ, and in consequence, that the worship of Christ was man-worship. 'In the same way,' are the words of Athanasius¹, 'you are false accusers, when you say that we affirm a duality of sons, and when you call us man-worshippers, &c.' In another place, again, he retorts upon Apollinarians the charge of imagining two Christs: '²If, therefore, Christ is different from the heavenly intellect that is in Him, but that Intellect is perfect, then are there two upon your own shewing; and that which you think blasphemy, yourselves are convicted of imagining.' Elsewhere, 'You imagine, when pressed hard, that if you confess Christ to have been God and man, you no longer speak of one but of two³.' And the same writer then condemns Apollinarianism, and by anticipation Nestorianism, as the opposite error, with which the faith of the Church had been charged by Apollinaris; '⁴Sense-

Apollina-
rian cavit.

¹ Τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ὑμεῖς συκοφαντοῦντες λέγετε ἡμᾶς δύο λέγειν υἱοὺς, καὶ ἀνθρωπολάτρας ἡμᾶς ὀνομάζετε, κ.τ.λ. *Ath. de Inc.* i. 21. *Vind. Cath.* i. 169.

² Εἰ γὰρ ἕτερός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς παρὰ τὸν ἐπουράνιον νοῦν τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ γεγόμενον, τέλειος δὲ καὶ ὁ νοῦς, δύο ἄρα καθ' ὑμᾶς καὶ ὕπερ

δυσφημεῖν δοκεῖτε, τοῦτο ἐλέγχεσθε φρονούντες. *Ibid.* i. 13. *Vind. Cath.* i. 157.

³ Ἀλλὰ στενοχωρούμενοι λογίζεσθε, ὅτι ἐὰν ὁμολογήσγητε Θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον τὸν Χριστὸν, οὐκ ἔτι ἓνα, ἀλλὰ δύο λέγετε. *Ibid.* ii. 12. *Vind. Cath.* i. 275.

⁴ Μάταιοι οὖν οἱ τῇ θεότητι

Præ-Nes-
torian
statements.

less therefore are they, that impute suffering to His Godhead, or that disbelieve his Manhood; or that affirm duality in the one [person of Christ].’ These several statements manifestly harmonise with the words of the Creed; but they were written earlier than the condemnation of Nestorius by more than half a century; therefore the appearance of a similar declaration in a creed framed before the time of Nestorius, can involve no idea of anachronism. About ten years later, Ambrose wrote his treatise on the Incarnation, and it contains a very similar expression of doctrine; ‘¹ Although He was always the eternal God, he took upon him the mystery of the Incarnation, undivided, and one; because both [the Godhead and the Manhood] are one [Christ], and one exists in both, that is, whether in the Godhead, or in the Body. He is not, as of the Father, one, and as of the Virgin, another; but being the same, He is of the Father in one manner, and of the Virgin in another.’ Again, ‘² We ought also to condemn those, who, in an opposite course of error, say that the Son of God is not one and the same; but that he who is begotten of God the Father is one, and He

αὐτοῦ πάθος προσάγοντες, ἣ τῇ ἐνανθρωπήσει αὐτοῦ ἀπιστοῦντες.
Ibid. 18, p. 285.

¹ ‘Cum Deus semper esset æternus, incarnationis sacramenta suscepit, non divisus sed unus; quia utrumque unus, et unus in utroque, hoc est, vel Divinitate vel corpore; non enim alter ex Patre, alter ex Virgine; sed idem aliter ex Patre, aliter ex Virgine.’ Ambros. *de Inc.* 35.

² ‘Et illos condemnare debemus, qui adversa erroris linea, non unum eundemque Filium Dei dicunt; sed alium esse qui ex Deo Patre natus [l. generatus] sit, alium qui sit generatus [l. natus] ex Virgine; cum Evangelista dicat quia Verbum caro factum est; ut unum Dominum Jesum, non duos crederes. Nonnulli etiam aliud Dei Verbum, aliud Dei Filium crediderunt,’ &c. *Ibid.* 47, 48.

who was born of the Virgin is another; whereas the Evangelist says, "The word was made flesh," in order that you might believe in one Lord Jesus, and not two. Some there are likewise who have believed that the Word of God is one, the Son of God another.' It was on account of this division of the One Person of Christ, by reason of the two natures, that the Apollinarian party was always charged with substituting a quaternity for the Trinity. So Ambrose says in a subsequent section of the same treatise: '1 And I am not afraid that I should seem to infer a quaternity, for we who assert this, truly worship the Trinity alone. I make no division indeed in Christ, when I distinguish the substance of his flesh from his Godhead; but I avow one Christ with the Father and with his Spirit; and I will demonstrate that they rather, who affirm that the Flesh of Christ is of one substance with his Godhead, infer a fourth person. For a body that is of the same substance, is not one [person], but one thing; for of a truth they who confessed in the formulary of the Nicene Council, that the Son is of the same substance with the

Τετράς
ἀντὶ
τριάδος.

¹ 'Nec timeo ne tetrada videar inducere, nos enim vere solam, qui hoc asserimus, colimus Trinitatem. Non enim Christum divido, cum carnis ejus Divinitatisque distinguo substantiam; sed unum Christum cum Patre et Spiritu Dei prædico, et illos magis qui carnem Christi unius cum Divinitate ejus dicunt esse substantiæ, tetrada inducere demonstrabo. Non enim quod ejusdem substantiæ est, unus, sed unum est; nam utique Filium ejusdem

cum Patre substantiæ confitentes in tractatu concilii Nicæni, non unam personam, sed unam Divinitatem in Patre et Filio crediderunt.' *Ibid.* 77.

Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα πιστεύειν ἔδογμάτισαν· μήτε ἑτέραν τινὰ φύσιν ἐπεισάγοντες τῇ θείᾳ καὶ μακαρίᾳ Τριάδι· μήτε τι τῶν ἐκ τῆς Τριάδος ἀποτέμνοντες, εἰς τὴν τῆς πίστεως ἔκθεσιν. *Amphiloch. Ep. Synod. Vind. Cath.* i. 454.

Τετράς
ἀντὶ
τριάδος.

Father, believed not that the Person, but that the Godhead of the Father and Son is one.' It is to be observed that Athanasius charges Apollinaris with the same extravagance of impiety: ¹ Δώσετε οὖν καὶ τῇ ὁμοουσίῳ σαρκὶ τὴν τελειότητα πρὸς τῇ τοῦ λόγου τελειότητι· ἔσται δὲ καθ' ὑμᾶς τετράς ἀντὶ τριάδος καταγγελλομένη. Again: ² Τί ἔτι ἡμῶς μέμφεσθε, ὡς τετράδα ἀντὶ τριάδος λέγοντας, αὐτοὶ τετράδα ἀντὶ τριάδος, καὶ ἄκοντες ὁμολογοῦντες, λέγοντες, ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τῇ τριάδι τὴν σάρκα. In fact, the Apollinarian was only pierced by his own weapon. The Catholic faith having been accused by him of introducing a quaternity, ³ Ὁμοούσιον γὰρ ἐὰν εἴπωμεν, φασί, τὸ σῶμα τῷ Λόγῳ, μένει ἡ Τριάς Τριάς, οὐδὲν ξένον εἰς αὐτὴν ἐπιφερομένου τοῦ Λόγου· ἐὰν δὲ ἀνθρώπινον εἴπωμεν τὸ ἐκ Μαρίας σῶμα, ἀνάγκη ξένου ὄντος κατ' οὐσίαν τοῦ σώματος, καὶ ὄντος ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ Λόγου, τετράς ἀντὶ Τριάδος γίνεται, διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος προσθήκην.

Chrysostom also, in his celebrated Epistle to Cæsarius, written at the close of the fourth century, takes up the same theological position with the Creed: ⁴ It is a highly pious thing to confess

¹ Athanas. *de Inc.* i. 9. *Vind. Cath.* i. 152.

² *Ibid. Vind. Cath.* i. 156.

³ Athanas. *ad Epictet. Vind. Cath.* i. 312.

⁴ 'Pium et valde pium, Christum qui morte circumdatus est confiteri, in divinitate perfectum, et in humanitate perfectum, unum Filium Unigenitum, non dividendum in Filiorum dualitatem; portantem tamen in semetipso indivisarum duarum

naturarum inconvertibiliter proprietates; non alterum et alterum, absit, sed unum et eundem Dominum Jesum Deum Verbum, carne nostra amictum, et ipsa non inanimata aut irrationabili, sicut impius Apollinaris dicit.....Etsi enim duplex natura, verum tamen indivisibilis et indissipabilis unitio, in una filiationis confitenda persona, et una subsistentia.' S. Joh. Chrysost. *ad Cæs. sar. Vind. Cath.* iii. 329.

that Christ, who was subject to death, was perfect in Godhead, perfect also in Manhood, the one only-begotten Son, not to be divided into a duality of sons; but having in himself inconvertibly the properties of the two undivided natures; not one and another, far from it, but one and the same Lord Jesus, God the Word, clothed in our flesh, itself neither soulless nor non-rational, as the impious Apollinaris asserts...For although there is a twofold nature, still the inseparable and indissoluble union of these is to be confessed in one person of sonship, and in one subsistence.' The statement in the Creed then, may have arisen very naturally out of the catholic tone of thought at the close of the fourth century. Throughout it agrees closely with the theology of this period, but scarcely with that of the Nestorian times; we are, therefore, justified in asserting, that the composer of this Creed inserted the clause, now under consideration, in refutation of the Apollinarian cavil, that the Catholic faith taught a duality of persons; but that it has no reference whatever to the duality of sons, which was asserted by Nestorius.

33 UNUS AUTEM, NON CONVERSIONE DIVINITATIS IN CARNEM, SED ASSUMPTIONE HUMANITATIS IN DEUM.

34 UNUS OMNINO, NON CONFUSIONE SUBSTANTIÆ, SED UNITATE PERSONÆ.

We are confirmed again in the opinion that the Creed was written prior to Nestorian times, by the tenour of this article; which first refutes the Apollinarian *συναλοιφή* of two natures, and then

Conclu-
sion.

Parallelism
of ideas.

subjoins the contrary Catholic tenet, in words that even Nestorius would hardly disclaim; 'One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh; but by the taking of the Manhood into God.' The impersonation, so to speak, of the Son of Man, was effected by this assumption of the flesh. The creating of the flesh, and the taking it into God, was but one act. The Son of Man, before non-existent, now first had a being, the Word, or eternally subsisting Son of God, having taken upon him the flesh; but his personal subsistence was the same; He was the Son of God and the Son of Man, but the person was one, and that person was Christ. There is a parallelism also of phrase between this verse and the next, that clearly marks this. The words, 'Unus autem non conversione Divinitatis in carnem,' correspond with the term, 'Unus omnino non confusione substantiæ,' the two are in fact identical in meaning; we may look therefore for a correlative identity in the subordinate members; and the statement in the one, 'Sed assumptione Humanitatis in Deum,' will mark the same reality with the words of the other, 'Sed unitate Personæ.' Unity of Person therefore in Christ, both God and Man, has subsisted from the moment that the first rudimental element of humanity was created and 'taken into God.' Now this truth is very precisely and clearly worked out by Tertullian, in words that run too closely to the purpose to be abridged: 'But we find him expressly declared to be both God and Man; accord-

ing to the words of the Psalm : “¹ Quoniam Deus Tertullian.
Homo natus est in illa, et ædificavit eam voluntate Patris.” Surely in every respect, the Son of God and the Son of Man; since [he was] God and Man, and without doubt, according to either substance, distinct in its own property; for neither is the Word any thing else than God, nor is the flesh any thing else than man. So the Apostle teaches us with regard to the twofold substance; He, “who was made of the seed of David,” must be Man, and the Son of Man. He who hath been demonstrated already to be the Son of God according to the Spirit, must be God, and the Word, the Son of God. We see here a twofold state, not fused together, but conjoined in one person, God and the Man Jesus; but this I say of Christ; and the property of each substance is preserved, so that the Spirit discharged its functions in Him, that is, by works and signs and miracles; and the flesh fulfilled its passions, being anhungered when tempted of the devil, athirst when conversing with the Samaritan woman, weeping over Lazarus, sorrow-

¹ Ps. lxxxvi. 4. These words of the Psalm are mistranslated in the same remarkable way, *adv. Marc.* iv. 13. It is needless to say that Tertullian follows some gross corruption of the text, for which there is not the slightest critical foundation. The Arabic version indicates

the reading followed by the LXX. translators; *Μήτηρ Σιών ἐρεῖ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐγεννήθη ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐθεμελίωσεν αὐτήν ὁ ὕψιστος.* ‘Of Sion it is said, O Mother of Man, that man was born of her, the Most High Himself hath established her for ever.’

قِيلَ عَلَى صِهْيُونَ يَا أُمَّ الْإِنْسَانِ وَإِنْسَانٌ وُلِدَ مِنْهَا هُوَ
الْعَلِيِّ أَسَسَهَا إِلَى الْأَبَدِ

Tertullian ful even unto death, and at the last expiring. If he had been a compound, fused together from both, as some mixed metal, such clear proof of either substance would not have appeared; but of a truth the Spirit, by transfer should have been performing functions proper to the flesh, and the flesh those peculiar to the Spirit, or by confusion, those functions should have been neither fleshly nor spiritual, but of some third mixed character; nay, either the Word should have suffered death, or the flesh should have been free from death, if the Word had been converted into flesh; and either the flesh should have been immortal, or the Word mortal. But since both substances distinctly performed their functions, each in its own nature, therefore each had its own proper work and natural issue. Wherefore learn with Nicodemus, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." The flesh neither becomes spirit, nor does the spirit become flesh; but manifestly they may coexist in one person. Jesus consisted of these; of the flesh he was Man, of the Spirit God; whom accordingly the angel styled the Son of God, with reference to that part of Him which is Spirit, reserving to the flesh the appellation of the Son of Man. So also the Apostle, denominating him the Mediator between God and men, affirmed it with respect to either substance¹.

¹ "Sed enim invenimus illum directo et Deum et Hominem expositum, ipso hoc psalmo suggerente, "Quoniam Deus Homo natus est in illa, et ædificavit eam, voluntate

Patris." Certe usquequaque Filium Dei et Filium Hominis, cum Deum et Hominem sine dubio secundum utramque substantiam in sua proprietate distantem; quia neque Ser-

The reader will not fail to observe several points of marked likeness between these words and several portions of the Creed, and observing them, he will hardly refuse his assent to the words of Bishop Kaye, and 'be almost disposed to conclude that the framer of the [Athanasian] Creed had Tertullian's expressions immediately in his view.' Here again then we find, that we are independent of Augustine; neither is there any critical reason, so far as this clause is concerned, for saying that the Creed was compiled from his works. In another place Tertullian records, as one of the objections of heresy, that the Flesh could not be assumed by Christ, without conversion of the Godhead into the Manhood. 'Now you cannot say, "if he had

followed in
the Creed.

p. 564.
Ed. 1843.

mo aliud quam Deus, neque caro aliud quam Homo. Sic et Apostolus de utraque ejus substantia docet, "Qui factus est, inquit, ex semine David," hic erit Homo et Filius Hominis; qui definitus est Filius Dei, secundum Spiritum, Hic erit Deus, et Sermo, Dei Filius. Videmus duplicem statum, non confusum sed conjunctum in una persona, Deum et Hominem Jesum. De Christo autem dissero. Et adeo salva est utriusque proprietas substantiæ, ut et spiritus res suas egerit in illo, id est virtutes et opera et signa; et caro passiones suas functa sit, esuriens sub diabolo, sitiens sub Samaritide, flens Lazarum, anxia usque ad mortem, denique et mortua est. Quod si tertium quid esset, ex utroque confusum, ut electrum, non tam distincta documenta parerent utriusque substantiæ. Sed et spiritus carnalia, et caro spiritalia

egisset, ex translatione; aut neque carnalia neque spiritalia, sed tertie alicujus formæ ex confusione; imo aut Sermo mortuus esset, aut caro mortua non esset, si Sermo conversus esset in carnem; aut caro enim immortalis fuisset, aut Sermo mortalis. Sed quia substantiæ ambæ in statu suo quæque distincte agebant, ideo illis et operæ et exitus sui occurrerunt. Disce igitur cum Nicodemo, "Quia quod ex carne natum est, caro est; et quod de spiritu, spiritus est." Neque caro spiritus fit, neque spiritus caro; in uno plane esse possunt. Ex his Jesus constituit, ex carne homo, ex spiritu Deus; quem tunc angelus ex ea parte, qua Spiritus erat, Dei Filium pronuntiavit, servans carni Filium Hominis dici.' Tertull. *adv. Prax.* 27.

¹ 'Non potes dicere, si natus fuisset, et hominem vere induisset,

Ambrose been born, and had really put on man, he ceased to be God, since he must lose what He is, by assuming what He is not." For the nature of God suffers no risk of loss. But, you say, "I therefore deny that God was truly converted into Man, so as to be born and to become incarnate; because it must needs be, that he who is eternal must also be inconvertible. For conversion into a different state marks the termination of former being. Conversion therefore attaches not to him, whom no end affects."'

Ambrose gives a fresh direction and application to these most sound statements of Tertullian; and, whether or no the writer of the Creed followed the African father, he may easily be supposed to have moulded his doctrinal periods upon some such words of Ambrose as Theodoret has preserved. 'Those, however, who affirm that Christ was mere man, or that God the Word was susceptible of suffering, or converted into flesh; or that he had a body consubstantial [with the Divinity]; or that he

deus esse desisset, amittens quod erat, dum assumit quod non erat. Periculum enim status sui deo nullo est. Sed ideo, inquis, nego Deum in hominem vere conversum, ita ut et nasceretur, et carne corporaretur; quia qui sine fine est, etiam inconvertibilis sit, necesse est. Converti enim in aliud, finis est pristini.' *De carne Chr.* 3. Elsewhere Tertullian puts the alternative, that Christ must either have been transformed into the flesh, or put on flesh, and only allows the latter to express the truth, 'Igitur Sermo in carne; dum et de hoc

quærendum quomodo sermo caro sit factus? Utrumne quasi transfiguratus in carne, an indutus carnem? Imo indutus.' *Adv. Prax.* 27. Also in the same chapter, *De carne Chr.*: 'Quasi non valuerit Christus Hominem indutus, Deus perseverare.' It is 'evident therefore that Tertullian's own doctrine was that of the Creed, that Christ was 'One, not by conversion of the Godhead into Flesh; but by the [assumption] taking of the Manhood into God.'

¹ Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν Χριστὸν, ἣ παθητὸν

brought it down from heaven, or that it was spectral; or who say that the Word, as God, was the prey of death, and had need to be raised up of the Father; or that he took a soulless body, man without mind; or that the two natures of Christ were fused together, and became one nature by intermixture; and who do not confess, that there were two natures without confusion in our Lord Jesus Christ, and but one person, inasmuch as He is one Christ, and one Son; all these the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematises.’

Possibly this same clause may afford ground for placing the composition of the Creed higher by several years than A. D. 431. For it is remarkable that the same treatise that has already been quoted as a post-Ephesine production of ¹Theodoret, seems to make use of a portion of these words, and in Greek: *γενόμενον δὲ ἄνθρωπον, οὐ τῇ τροπῇ τῆς θεότητος, ἀλλὰ τῇ προσλήψει τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος.* ‘Non conversione Divinitatis in

quoted by
Theodoret.

τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον, ἢ εἰς σάρκα τραπεύτα, ἢ συνουσιωμένον ἐσχηκέναι τὸ σῶμα, ἢ οὐρανῶθεν τοῦτο κεκομικέναι, ἢ φάντασμα εἶναι, ἢ θνητὸν λέγοντας τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον δεδεῆσθαι τῆς παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀναστάσεως, ἢ ἄψυχον τὸ σῶμα ἀειληφέναι, ἢ ἄνουν ἄνθρωπον, ἢ τὰς δύο φύσεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ ἀνάκρασιν συγχυθείσας, μίαν γεγενῆσθαι φύσιν, καὶ μὴ ὁμολογούντας εἰς Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δύο φύσεις εἶναι ἀσυγχύτους, ἐν δὲ πρόσωπον, καθὼς εἰς Χριστὸς, εἰς Υἱὸς, τοὺτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

In words the following passage may be less similar, but the theological sentiments are the same: ‘Sed dum hos redarguimus, emergunt alii qui carnem Domini et Divinitatem dicant unius esse naturæ. Quæ tantum sacrilegium inferna vomuerunt? Jam tolerabiliore sunt Ariani, quorum per istos perfidiæ robur adolescit, ut majore contentione asserant Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum unius non esse substantiæ; quia isti Divinitatem Domini et carnem substantiæ unius dicere tentaverunt.’ Ambros. *de Inc.* 49.

¹ Theod. *adv. Var. Prop.* vi. 1.

Is the Creed
quoted

carnem, sed assumptione Humanitatis in Deum.' Perhaps also the words, 'Qualis Pater, talis Filius,' may have suggested the fuller statement that soon follows: "Ὅπερ ἂν τις ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας νοήσῃ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Μονογενοῦς τοῦτο πάντως εὐρήσῃ. The assertion too that Christ is 'Deus ex substantia Patris ante sæcula genitus,' may be identified in Theodoret's, "Ἀτρεπτον γὰρ ἔχει τὴν τῆς θεότητος φύσιν, καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον, καθάπερ ὁ πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων γεννήσας αὐτὸν Πατήρ. Now internal evidence enables us to fix upon the year 450, or the early part of 451, as the date of this treatise. Flavian is mentioned as having been a late incumbent of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and he died in the year 449; no mention is made of Eutychian opinions, either directly or indirectly; which could hardly have been the case, if it had been written subsequently to the Council of Chalcedon in 451. There are no more than two years therefore remaining for choice; and the opening words would enable us to fix upon the year of the temporary deposition of Theodoret from his see, in 450, as the most probable date of this production¹. Certainly, if this Creed had existed, as has been surmised, for half a century, and its expressions brought into prominent notice in the Western Church by the work of Augustine, *De Trinitate*, more than thirty years before, it could scarcely have escaped the notice of Theodoret; for although

¹ Theodoret, in an epistle [82] written to Eusebius of Ancyra, in the year 447, recounts the titles of his various works, in vindication of his

orthodoxy. This work, *adv. Varias Propositiones*, is not quoted by him, and the omission so far confirms the correctness of the date assigned.

he was Bishop of Cyrus in Euphratesian Syria, he was well versed¹ in the theology both of the East and West. Considering, therefore, the very full refutation of Apollinarianism by the Greek Fathers, it is scarcely probable that this Creed, speaking so decidedly, as it does, upon the question of the day, should have remained unknown in the East. There is nothing also in the confession of the subsistence of the Holy Ghost by procession, which would bring this creed under suspicion in the Greek Church, prior to the insertion of the term *Filioque* in the Nicene Creed; it may have fallen into disuse indeed, after this date, and its versions may have been surreptitiously brought to harmonise more completely with the Greek theology; but these possibilities are wholly consistent with the notion, that if the Creed was composed at the close of the fourth century, it should have been known and valued by Greek readers of Latin theology before the middle of the fifth. The words of Theodoret certainly give colour to the supposition. And it is no less certain, that if these Greek words do betray a cognisance of the Latin Creed, that Creed must be carried considerably higher in point of time, than the date assigned to it by Waterland in 430. It is also remarkable that the definition of faith, put forth by the Council of Chalcedon at this same time, should contain

by
Theodoret?

¹ Ταύτην [τὴν διδασκαλίαν] οἱ κατὰ τὴν ἐφ᾽αν, καὶ τὴν ἐσπέραν διαπρέψαντες ἄγιοι, κ.τ.λ. 7. *Vind. Cath.* i. 207; and he proceeds to quote the authority of the Latin

writers Cyprian, Damasus, Ambrose, τῇ Ῥωμαίων χρόμενοι γλώττῃ..... οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ διαφορά τῶν γλωττῶν διαφορὰν δογμάτων εἰργάσατο. *Ibid.*

Council of
Chalcedon.

expressions manifesting a degree of similarity with the Creed that can hardly be the effect of accident, such as: 'Treading therefore in the steps of the holy [Nicene] fathers, we confess one and the same Son our Lord Jesus Christ, and we all harmoniously teach, that He, the same, was perfect in Godhead, and perfect in Manhood; very God, and very Man, of a reasonable soul and body, of one substance with the Father as touching the Godhead, and of one substance with us as touching his Manhood; in Godhead begotten of the Father before all worlds, and in Manhood, [born] of the Virgin Mary the Mother of God, in these last days, and acknowledged to be one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, in both natures unconfusedly, inconvertibly, indivisibly, inseparably [subsisting]¹.' It might be difficult to say whether these sentences contain clearer marks of reference to the Nicene, or to the Athanasian Creed. At least, this latter exposition of the faith would seem, either directly or indirectly, to have exercised an influence on the theological definition of the Chalcedonian Council.

¹ Ἐπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἀγίοις πατράσιν, ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογοῦμεν Ὑῖόν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκουμεν, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν Θεότητι, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, Θεὸν ἀληθῶς, καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῶς, τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν Θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν, χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας·

πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν Θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς Θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστόν, Ὑῖόν, Κύριον, Μονογενῆ, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον. *Def. Fid. ap. conc. Chalced.* *Vind. Cath.* III. 41.

40 NAM SICUT ANIMA RATIONALIS ET CARO UNUS EST HOMO; ITA DEUS ET HOMO UNUS EST CHRISTUS. Substance
of the soul.

These words have a twofold bearing upon Apollinarianism. In the first place, they assert two distinct substances in man, the one material and bodily, the other immaterial and spiritual. This Apollinarianis denied, although graver errors may have attracted more attention. Then again, as body and soul form the one person of Man, so the Creed declares that God and Man form one Christ. But there is no confusion of substance; even as body and soul, though conjoined, are not confounded. The denial of this, of course, was the very essence of Apollinarianism. With respect to the former point, Athanasius informs us that Apollinarianis first imagined in man a confusion of the two substances of Mind and Matter; ‘¹Why therefore do you say with respect to the soul, that both body and soul is the outer man, that is, as the blood and flesh? But as the body and blood cannot escape contact and lesion, being visible, prove to us that neither does the soul escape them, and that it is visible. But if you cannot prove this, the matter is evident, that the soul is neither visible, nor is it killed like the body by man....Believe therefore that the soul is the inner man.’

¹ Τί οὖν περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐρεῖτε, ὅτι καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ ὁ ἕξωθέν ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, τὸ αἷμα καὶ τὴν σάρκα. ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ αἷμα οὐ διαφεύγουσι τὴν ψηλάφησιν καὶ τὴν τρώσιν ὁρατὰ ὄντα, δείξατε ἡμῖν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν μὴ διαφεύγου-

σαν ταῦτα, καὶ ὁρατὴν οὖσαν. ἡ εἰ μὴ δύνασθε δεῖξαι, φανερός ἐστιν ὁ λόγος, ὅτι οὐτε ὁρατὰ ψυχὴ, οὐτε ἀποκτείνεται ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου ὥσπερ τὸ σῶμα, καθὼς εἴρηκεν ὁ Κύριος. πείσθητε οὖν, ὅτι ὁ ἕσωθεν ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ. Ath. *De Inc.* i. 13. *Vind. Cath.* i. 158.

Idea of the
soul's cor-
poreity.

Again, in his second book on the Incarnation ; ‘¹ And if the soul is fleshly as you say, how is it that it does not die with the body, and perish with it?’ Believing, therefore, that the body and soul of man, by an intimate interpenetration, became of one heterogeneous substance and nature, it was by an easy step that they applied the same theory to describe the conjunction of two persons in Christ. Apollinaris, no doubt, derived his psychological notion from the contemporary schools of philosophy, in which it was not always taught that the soul is wholly incorporeal. The idea had descended from the very earliest ages. Aristotle at least imputes the opinion first to Empedocles², that our perception of the material is owing to the correlative materiality of the soul ; and subsequently, though without reason, to Plato ; Πλατῶν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐκ τῶν στοιχείων ποιεῖ, γινώσκεται γὰρ ὁμοίῳ ὁμοιον, τὰ δὲ πράγματα ἐκ τῶν ἀρχῶν εἶναι. He may have misunderstood Plato, but the idea itself existed as a matter of philosophical belief.

The soul, so constituted, might very easily be supposed to be fused together, as it were, with the body, so as to combine in one compound substance, neither wholly spiritual nor wholly material, still, one and inseparable, and not divisible into the outer and inner man, but *sui generis* and compact. Next, it was also believed very generally in these same schools, the teeming nursery of heresy, that

¹ Καὶ πῶς εἰ σαρκικὴ ἡ ψυχὴ καθ’ ὑμᾶς, οὐ συνθνήσκει τῷ σώματι καὶ συμφθίρεται. *Ibid.* II. 8.

Vind. Cath. I. 269.

² *Arist. de Anim.* I. 2.

the Deity also was in a certain sense corporeal¹; by an easy transition, therefore, the belief that soul and body made one nature by intermixture, extended itself from physical to theological reasonings; and those who believed in the corporeal substance of the soul, were easily persuaded that the Godhead of Christ became by no non-natural fusion the Human Being Christ; and that the Godhead was combined with the Manhood, in the same way in which the souls of men, or bodies of spirit, were intimately blended and intermixed with bodies of flesh. The data we possess of Apollinarian tenets, as exposed by Athanasius and other writers of the latter part of the fourth century, would seem to indicate this origin of the monstrous notion, that by any possibility the Godhead could become mingled with Humanity in one mixed binary nature. Whether indeed the idea was first struck out by Apollinaris, or whether the latent spark of heresy that had long been smouldering was kindled into more active life by him, is imma-

Cause of
Apollina-
rian mis-
belief.

¹ Aristotle says, that Zeno, (not the Stoic,) affirmed God to be a body: *αὐτὸς γὰρ σῶμα λέγει εἶναι τὸν θεόν*. Tertullian believed, not only that the soul was corporeal, but that the Deity also had a similarly constituted substance; according to Augustine, 'Timuit ne nihil esset, si corpus non esset, nec de Deo valuit aliter sapere.' *Aug. de Gen. ad Lit.* x. 41. Where the soul was held to be material, the same was believed of the Deity; 'Animam tamen corpus esse non audeant credere aut dicere; maxime propter quod dixi, ne Deum quoque ipsum

nihil aliud opinentur esse quam corpus, etsi excellentissimum, etsi naturæ cujusdam propriæ cætera supergradientis, corpus tamen.' *Ib.* 40. Hobbes has been charged with holding this gross notion of the Deity, but unjustly. (Leland). His belief is expressed in the formula; 'Whatever is conceivable, is conceived through sense; but God can not be conceived through sense; therefore God is inconceivable.' The mischievous paralogism of the major proposition is evident; though no atheist himself, his principles tend to atheism. *Leviath.* 1, 3, 31.

Mark of a
Western
Origin

terial; as soon as the heretical notion was taught, it was instantly condemned; and a more close and accurate refutation of it is nowhere to be found, than that which this Creed has perpetuated. It would seem that the heretical result alone of the Apollinarian confusion of the two natures¹, may have reached the West, otherwise the composer of this Creed would have refrained perhaps from using an illustration that Apollinarian psychology invalidated; for he who could believe the soul and body to be one mixed substance, would only be confirmed in heresy, if he were told that, 'as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and Man is one Christ.' He would allow indeed the correctness of the illustration, but he would add, that there was the same confusion of substance in the one case as in the other. Hence, may not this clause, as compared with the account of Athanasius, be accepted as one more proof of a Latin rather than a Greek extraction?

¹ There is an epistle ascribed to Ambrose, in which man is said to be constituted by the union of two natures in one *person*, entirely in the spirit of this portion of the Creed; 'Cur autem inconveniens aut impossibile videatur, ut Verbum et caro atque anima unus homo Christus, et unus Dei hominisque sit Filius, si caro et anima, quæ dissimilium naturarum sunt, unam faciunt, etiam sine Verbi Incarnatione, personam.' Ambros. *ad Hieronym.* ed. Paris. 1842. Maximus expresses the same analogy; ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ταυτότης μὲν ἐστὶ προσώπου· ἐτερότης δὲ οὐσιῶν· ἐνὸς

γὰρ ὄντος ἀνθρώπου, ἄλλης οὐσίας ἐστὶν ἢ ψυχῇ, καὶ ἄλλης ἢ σάρξ. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ δεσπότου Χριστοῦ· ταυτότης μὲν ἐστὶ προσώπου· ἐτερότης δὲ, οὐσιῶν· ἐνὸς γὰρ ὄντος προσώπου, ἦτοι ὑποστάσεως, ἐτέρας οὐσίας ἐστὶν ἡ θεότης, καὶ ἐτέρας ἡ ἀνθρωπότης. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος ὁμολογεῖν μὲν τὴν ἕνωσιν, μὴ ἐκφωνεῖν δὲ τὴν διαφορὰν· οὕτως ἀνάγκη πᾶσα ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνὸς τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος, καὶ τὴν ἕνωσιν καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν κηρύττειν. Maximus, *De duab. Nat. 2. Vind. Cath.* i. 105. A.D. 600.

The opinions of Apollinaris were more accurately known in the Greek Church, in their full length and breadth; and however frequently this illustration may have been applied by Latin writers, it was cautiously avoided by those Greek Fathers who first had occasion to touch upon the heresy. It is indeed remarkable, that this Creed should have been assigned to Athanasius, whose account of Apollinaris, given above, makes it so very improbable that he should have used this equivocal illustration. But the real meaning of the article is very evident; and it having been stated in the words immediately preceding, that Christ is 'one altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of Person,' even heretical perverseness could not fail to attach to the following words, the only meaning that their author intended they should bear; and that is, that as material and immaterial substance together form one human person, though without blending the one with the other, so the Divine and the Human substance together form one Christ, but with no confusion or intermixture of the Godhead with the Manhood.

rather
than
Eastern.

41 QUI PASSUS EST PRO SALUTE NOSTRA, DESCENDIT AD INFEROS, TERTIA DIE RESURREXIT A MORTUIS.

42 ASCENDIT AD CÆLOS, SEDET AD DEXTRAM PATRIS; INDE VENTURUS EST JUDICARE VIVOS ET MORTUOS.

43 AD CUJUS ADVENTUM OMNES HOMINES RESURGERE HABENT CUM CORPORIBUS SUIS, ET REDDITURI SUNT DE FACTIS PROPRIIS RATIONEM.

The doctrines contained in the remaining arti-

Proof of a
true human
nature.

cles have been explained already in the corresponding clauses of the two preceding Creeds, to which the reader is now referred. It only seems necessary to observe, that the descent of the soul of Christ into hell, which had always been the belief of the Church, became embodied in the Roman Creed after the rise of Apollinarianism. But if the Church always believed the descent into hell, the perfect human nature of Christ must always have been equally a matter of faith; for manifestly it was not the body of Christ that effected that descent, but the soul¹; and the Godhead was not more peculiarly there, than every where else and in all things; it remains therefore that the descent into hell could only apply to the true human soul of Christ; when severed from the body by death, it was reduced to exactly the same state, as that which marks the existence of every other soul of man, between Death and Judgment². But the Godhead was equally with the soul in Hades, and with the Body of our Lord in the sepulchre; from the time of the Annunciation, God and Man formed one Christ, and death had no power to dissolve the union, that had been predestined from everlasting in the counsels of the Most High. In every respect, therefore, Apollinarianism caused this doctrine to assume great dis-

¹ Τὸ μέντοι [σῶμα] μέχρι τάφου φθάσαν, ἡ δὲ μέχρι ἕδου διαβᾶσα. διαιρετῶν δὲ ὄντων τῶν τόπων πολλῶ τῷ μέτρῳ, καὶ τοῦ μὲν τάφου σωματικὴν ἐπιδεχομένου τὴν ἐπίβασιν, ἐκεῖσε παρῆν τὸ σῶμα· τοῦ δὲ ἕδου ἀσώματον.

Ath. de Inc. i. 13. Vind. Cath. i. 158.

² Μήτε τῆς θεότητος, τοῦ σώματος ἐν τῷ τάφῳ ἀπολιμπανόμενης, μήτε τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν τῷ ἕδῳ χωριζομένης. Ibid. ii. 14. Vind. Cath. i. 278.

tinctness. It became a fixed dogma in the Creed of the Western Church; and Catholic writers of the Greek Communion, in refuting the wild notions of the Bishop of Laodicea and his followers, did not fail to take their stand upon this ancient element of their traditional faith. Augustine again in the South speaks of the doctrine as no unimportant portion of the Catholic Faith; 'Quis ergo, nisi infidelis negaverit fuisse apud Inferos Christum?' The doctrine, thus universally received, can be traced back to the very earliest times. Eusebius records it as an element of apostolical preaching in Syria. Irenæus alleges it in Gaul. Tertullian, as a member of the African Church, says¹; 'Though Christ be God, still since he is man, having died according to the Scriptures, and being buried conformably with the same, he satisfied also this law, and fulfilled in hell the condition of human death. Nor did he ascend up into heavenly places, before he had descended into the lower parts of the earth;' 'ut illic patriarchas et prophetas compotes sui faceret;' and the benefit conferred upon them was, that they accompanied Christ in the Resurrection; 'Immo inquis in Paradiso, quo jam tunc et Patriarchæ et Prophetæ appendices dominicæ resurrectionis, ab inferis migraverint.' Ambrose, following in his steps, takes the same peculiar view of the effects of the descent in-

The
doctrine
Catholic.

H. E. i. c. ult.

C. Hæc. iii.
23; iv. 45;
v. 31.

¹ 'Quod si Christus Deus, quia et homo, mortuus secundum scripturas, et sepultus secundum easdem; huic quoque legi satisfecit, forma humanæ mortis apud inferos func-

tus. Nec ante ascendit in sublimiora cœlorum, quam descendit in inferiora terrarum.' Tertull. *de An.* 55.

Received
in Italy.

to Hell, that is common to Tertullian and some of the Greek Fathers; namely, that he then ‘preached to the spirits in prison.’ ‘Jam, si placet, accipiamus, secundum mysterium in inferioribus Christi fuisse substantiam. Etenim ut defunctorum animas in sui corporis anima liberaret, vincula mortis solveret, peccata donaret, operatus est in inferno¹.’ Hence also he writes in the Treatise on the Incarnation; ‘Et quando in morte fuit, in umbra non erat. Denique etiam in inferno positus vitæ lumen fundebat æternæ. Radiabat etiam illic lux vera Sapientiæ; illuminabat infernum, sed inferno non claudebatur².’

But however Ambrose may have followed Tertullian in his explanation, it does not at all follow that he should have received the doctrine itself from any other source than from some Latin form of the Creed. The Symbol in use at Milan was that of Rome; and this clause had not yet been incorporated into it³, as we learn from Ruffinus. Clearly, therefore, it had been no part of his baptismal confession. But in the not very distant Church of Aquileia it was received, as of equal authority with the rest of the Creed. And for reasons that are found below in the note, it is very im-

¹ Ambros. *de Fide*, III. 111.

² Id. *de Incarn.* 41.

³ Thus Ruffinus, writing about ten years later than Ambrose, says, ‘Sciendum sane est, quod in Ecclesiæ Romanæ symbolo non habetur additum, Descendit ad Inferna.’ The indirect and superficial way in which the Apollinarian heresy is mentioned among others by this

same writer, without naming the author, convinces the judgment, that it was from no fear of this error that the article was inserted in the Aquileian Creed. ‘Concilium vanitatis est et hoc, quod olim congregavit pertinax et prava contentio; asserens Christum carnem quidem humanam suscepisse, non tamen et animam rationalem; cum

probable that the heresy should in any way have caused the reception of the words at Aquileia. The article was at length inserted after a particular date in the Roman Creed, as a preventive rather than as a curative measure; but not so with the Aquileian formulary, in which it formed an original portion, without reference to the particular class of error now under consideration. Ruffinus, at least, assigns no particular reason for its later insertion. It may be observed also that the position of Aquileia at the head of the Adriatic, would indicate the probability, that the Gospel should have reached it through some primary channel from the East, and not by dissemination from Rome. Discrepancy therefore in the two Creeds need occasion no surprise. Certain it is that the Aquileian Rule of Faith exhibits an Oriental cast, and Eusebius has shewn that this clause, peculiar to it, had existed from primitive times in a short body of apostolical doctrine found at Edessa.

Creed of
Aquileia.

Now that which we can only affirm to be probable with respect to the origin of the Church of Aquileia, we know to be certain as regards the Churches of Gaul. Their early connexion with the Churches of the East is beyond a doubt¹. Hence the Churches of Lyons and Vienne wrote an account of the persecution under M. Aurelius, and of the constancy of their martyrs, not to the Church

utique et carni et animæ, et sensui humano ac menti una eademque salus a Christo collata sit.' When the clause was adopted at Rome, it would seem to have been inserted

rather as a wise precaution against the possible irruption of heresy, than as an antidote of poison already actively at work.

¹ Burton, *Lect.* ix. A. D. 58.

Eastern
origin

of Rome, nor to any other of the Western branch of the Church Catholic, but to their brethren of Asia and Phrygia. The names also of many that received the martyr's crown on that occasion, indicate a Greek extraction. The venerable Bishop Pothinus was a Greek; whom the extreme old age of ninety years did not exempt from being sentenced to a death of torture. Irenæus, who in his early youth had heard St John's disciple, the martyr Polycarp at Smyrna, succeeded in the See of Lyons; facts, wholly corroborative of the hypothesis, that the foundation of the Gallican Church was laid by Orientals, and in the earliest age. The Gallican liturgy has also been traced back in a very satisfactory manner to the Asiatic Church¹; and it was this difference of liturgy, perhaps more than any other cause, that facilitated the incorporation of so important an addition as the word *Filioque* in the Nicene Creed. The same variation from the Roman Order would also account for the earlier reception of the Athanasian Creed into the Gallican Church. When the edict² of Charlemagne forced the use of the Roman Liturgy upon these Western Churches, late in the eighth century, such additions became for the future impossible. Hence it may be that if the Athanasian Creed is correctly assigned to the Western Church, the clause that mentions the Descent into Hell, may add one more mark of a Gallican origin to the composition, and enable us to account for its adoption into the

¹ Palmer, Diss. ix., on *Ancient Liturgies. Orig. Liturg.*

² Mabillon, *de Liturgia Gallicana*, i. 3.

Roman Creed. For if the words had always formed part of the Gallican Creed, as they had of the Aquileian, they would be traced back through the Asiatic Church to St John. When therefore the exhibition of these words in the Creed was demanded as a matter of precaution against heresy, their adoption, from so venerable and apostolical a source as the Gallican Creed, would scarcely raise a scruple even in the Church of Rome. Knowing the extreme tenacity shewn of old by this Church in resisting all additions to her Creed, it would be difficult to account in any other manner for the insertion, especially since there was never any very imminent risk at Rome of infection from Apollinarian taint.

of the
Gallican
Church.

The true scriptural ground, upon which the doctrine rests, has already been traced out in the words quoted from the Psalms by St Peter, upon the day of Pentecost; ‘Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption.’ When the substantive reality of Christ’s human soul was called in question, the belief in a Descent into Hell, that had existed in the Christian Church from the first moment of its existence, though not always expressed, was brought more prominently forward. Athanasius, in vindicating the Catholic doctrine against Apollinaris, frequently makes mention of it in proof of the true human soul of Christ; he says for example, ‘Neither was his decease, and the passing of his spirit, the departure of God from the body, but the separation of the soul. For our death was,

p. 343.

Acts ii. 26.

Athana-
sius.

there represented. But if God was separated from the body, and thus death was the result, how came it that the body separated from the incorruptible God manifested incorruption? Or how did the Word accomplish the descent into hell? or how did it effect the resurrection from Hades? Was it that Himself [the Logos], in lieu of a soul like ours, arose, that he might match the semblance of our resurrection? But how is it possible for us to imagine such a thing of God¹? Other passages to the same effect are not unfrequent in this author's writings, the principal of which are indicated below².

The Resurrection of our Lord on the third day, his Ascension into heaven, his enthronement on the right hand of God, his second Advent in power and great glory to judge both quick and dead, and the resurrection of all mankind, are subjects that have been discussed before; the reader therefore is referred to the corresponding clauses of the earlier Creeds for information upon those subjects.

44 ET QUI BONA EGERUNT IBUNT IN VITAM ÆTERNAM, QUI VERO MALA, IN IGNEM ÆTERNUM.

¹ οὐτε ἡ νέκρωσις καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ἀποχώρησις, Θεοῦ ἀπὸ σώματος ἢν μετάστασις, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος χωρισμός. ὁ γὰρ ἡμέτερος ἐκεῖ διεγράφετο θάνατος. εἰ δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἐχωρίσθη τοῦ σώματος, καὶ οὕτως ἡ νέκρωσις ἐδείκνυτο, πῶς τὸ σῶμα χωρισθὲν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Θεοῦ, τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν ἐπεδείκνυτο; πῶς δὲ καὶ ὁ Λόγος, τὴν εἰς ἑῶν ἐπίβασιν ἐποιήσατο; ἢ πῶς τὴν ἐξ ἑῶν ἀνάστα-

σιν ἐπεδείκνυτο; μῆτι γε αὐτὸς ἀντὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας ψυχῆς ἀνίστατο, ἵνα τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀναστάσεως τὴν εἰκόνα ἀρμόσῃται; καὶ πῶς οἶδν τε περὶ Θεοῦ ταῦτα ἐννοεῖν; *Ath. de Inc.* II. 15. *Vind. Cath.* I. 279.

² Athanas. c. *Apollinarius*, I. 5, 13, 14, 17. *Vind. Cath. Art.* II. *Epist. ad Epictetum.* *Ibid.* Art. IV. *Homil. in Pasch. Biblioth. Combesis.* p. 531.

Once more the reader is reminded of the practical nature of Christian faith: it is the object of the Gospel of Christ to bring the will of man, wayward, corrupt, and perverse as it is by nature, into unison with the will of God. He who is from all eternity, the express image of the Father, alone can effect this. 'That which is impossible with man is possible with God.' The reformation of man's will, that is in itself a natural impossibility, is not beyond the reach of Almighty power. There is no barrier insuperable to Divine Grace. Strength is given to man to perform the will of God; and with whatever degree of earnestness the work is done, in the same degree there is the pledge of a larger success for the future. If therefore 'they that have done good shall go into life eternal,' it is because by God's grace the natural will has been brought under subjection to the will of God; and since that will is man's sanctification, the deeds of a sanctified heart cannot fail of being the result. This then briefly marks the true connexion between the actions of a man's life and Christian faith. He who has learned to trace in all things that befall him, the gradual transfer of his will from the captivity of Satan to the allegiance of heaven, appreciates his true position in the world of grace. 'Thy will be done,' is his prayer of daily realization. Trials of faith he may have, but they shall make him stronger; infirmities may at times prevail, but their first approach shall be more carefully watched for the future; self will urge on its demands, but the Christian has learned to curb and moderate

¹ Thess. iv. 3.
Heb. x. 10.

αἰώνιος. his desires even in things lawful, that he may the better fight for his life against things unlawful. Such a course bespeaks the will of God performed with an increasing care; they are the outward and visible signs of inward regeneration of heart; and therefore, they that have given this evidence of a living faith, shall go into life eternal; the will of God has been realised in their sanctification, it will be accomplished also in their salvation.

But how are we to describe the word 'eternal'?
 Heb. vii. 3. As applied to God, it can only signify, 'Having neither beginning of days nor end of life.' It describes to us the everlasting duration of Him, who was, when nothing else was, who is, the Upholder and Preserver of all things visible and invisible, and who is to be for ever and ever, when heaven

¹ The word itself presents, upon analysis, the idea of continued endless existence, with no mark of beginning, no tendency to end, for the Latin word *aternus*, coming from *ætas* may be derived through *ævitas* and *ævum* from αἰῶν, according to Aristotle, αἰὲν ᾧν. The digamma may have been lost to the verb εἶμι in Homeric Greek; but there is reason for believing that in the oldest form of the Greek language, the Æolic dialect, every word beginning with a vowel was pronounced with the digamma. For instance, neither *ἄω* nor *ῥω* are observed in the Homeric Greek to be affected with the digamma; but its presence is hardly to be mistaken in the Latin words *flo* and *fluo*. In the instance therefore of the word αἰῶν, the absence of the digamma from the Ionic form would be no

bar to the proposed etymological analysis. By a similar analogy to the Æolic digamma, no word in the Shemitic languages is allowed to begin with a vowel; *aleph* is invariably prefixed; and the principle is more phonetically correct than ours. For no vowel can be enounced without a certain consonantal articulation, that Arabic and Hebrew grammarians describe as a 'constriction' of the throat. Let the reader pronounce the bare vowels, he will find that the sound, at first imagined to be simple, is easily resolvable into two, the consonantal articulation represented throughout the East by the Elif, and the vowel-sound, e.g. *á*, *è*, &c; where the accent represents the elif or sub-articulate constriction of the throat, that serves to enounce the vowel.

and earth shall be rolled up as a scroll, and the material world shall return once more to the nothing from whence it was made. Now whatever may be the etymology of *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, the first syllable is very clearly identified in *ἀεί*. The meaning also is no less distinct; for whereas the eternity of matter was the earliest tenet of Greek philosophy, so also the word *αἰών*, conveying an idea of the material universe, excluded all notion of a beginning; and the adjective *αἰώνιος* meant that which is uncreate in its origin, and indestructible in its essence. No better word therefore could be adopted by the Greek translator in rendering the Hebrew עולם, than this; his intention being to convey to the mind the notion of that which is without beginning or end. 'Æternus' being referrible to the same origin as *αἰώνιος*, is capable of no other explanation.

But this is no account of the way in which the Hebrew noun עולם acquired the meaning of eternal. In the sacred language its words are expressive of sacred ideas, its philosophical terms denote the traditions of revelation. The word in question comes from a root, meaning, 'to involve in concealment and mystery;' עולם is that which so conceals. The deep purpose of God in creating the world and its inhabitants, was designed in the inscrutable wisdom of God from everlasting; all things were for ever present in the Omniscient Wisdom of God. As the days of the Almighty, so, in the Divine counsels, has been the subsistence of the world. So the word עולם, or God's creation

עֹלָם in time, marked the condition of its subsistence in the Divine counsels, before the first dawn of creation, that is, from all eternity; and that which was hidden and at length revealed, equally with that which, when revealed, still veils the present and the future in mystery, was also styled עֹלָם. Therefore, as an idea of the eternity of matter caused the Greek to express eternity and the world by one term, so the Hebrew, perceiving an eternal relation between the creature and the Creator, denominated that relation, and the eternity that it involves, by the same term עֹלָם; signifying this present world, which God mysteriously upholds and preserves we know not how; denoting also the future world, that for the present is concealed from us; as well as the counsels of God, that were hidden in the inscrutable depths of Divine wisdom, long before the foundations of the earth were laid.

Job xlii. 3. ‘Who is He,’ Job asks, ‘that hideth [מַעְלִים] counsel,’ whose counsels are a mystery, בְּלִי־דַעַת, far above mortal intellect. The same idea is taken up and amplified by the Preacher, in a passage that closely connects the operation of Almighty Power in the works of creation with the eternal design of Infinite Wisdom. ‘He hath made every thing beautiful in his season; also He hath set eternity in the midst of them; [נָסַם אֶת־הָעֹלָם נָתַן בְּלִבָּם] so that no man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end. . . . I know that whatsoever God doeth it shall be for ever [לְעֹלָם]; nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it; and God doeth it that men should fear before

Eccles. iii.
11—15.

Him. That which hath been is now; and that which is to be hath already been; and God searcheth out [יִבְקֹשׁ] the past.¹ Truly to Him the past, the present, and the future, are all alike. The world then, is suitably termed עוֹלָם, as representing to us the veil that for the present interposes between the perceptions of the soul and the Eternal. The word also, not only marks the subsistence of the world in time; but it also denotes, on the one hand, the continued being of undying substance, when time shall be no more; and on the other, that same being pre-determined in the Counsels of the Most High, when as yet the universe was not

¹ The Hebrew faith in the pre-determinate counsels of the Great Creator, is expressed by the Psalmist (Ps. cxxxix. 15, 16): 'My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being imperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.' The same truth is taught, where the eternity of the Divine Wisdom is set forth with so much inspired eloquence by king Solomon, Prov. viii. 22—30. Philo expresses a like belief, but more in keeping with the philosophical language of his day, when he says: 'When God determined to create this visible world, he first formed it mentally; that making use of this incorporeal and most divine type, he might work out the material world; the recent counterpart of that more ancient plan, which should contain as many sensible species, as there

are intellectual types in the other. But it is not lawful to say or imagine that this universe of ideal subsistence has any local existence.... Neither can that ideal universe have any other local habitation than the Divine Word that hath disposed it.' [Philo, π. τῆς κοσμοποιίας.] But immediately afterwards he speaks of this archetypal plan as being identical with the Word: εἰ δέ τις ἐθελήσειε γυμνοτέροις χρῆσασθαι τοῖς ὀνόμασιν, οὐδὲν αὖν ἕτερον εἰποι τὸν νοητὸν εἶναι κόσμον, ἢ θεοῦ λόγον ἤδη κοσμοποιούντος.... διὸλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἡ ἀρχέτυπος σφραγίς, διφάμεν εἶναι κόσμον νοητὸν, αὐτὸς αὖν εἶη τὸ ἀρχέτυπον παράδειγμα, ἰδέα τῶν ἰδεῶν, ὁ θεοῦ λόγος. It is quite as probable that Philo should have borrowed this similitude of the seal and its impression from the book of Job, as from the schools of philosophy: 'Hast thou turned it out as clay from the seal? xxxviii. 14.'

[תַּתְּהַפֵּךְ בְּחֶמֶר חֹתֶם]

Eternal duration. <hr/>	created. Thus the idea of eternity is involved in this one word; an eternity, that is, of permanent duration; and the Being of God, who alone inhabiteth an eternity that has no beginning, is fitly defined by the same term, that declares the formation and fulfilment of his Allwise counsels. 'Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever the earth and the world were made, וּמֵעוֹלָם עַד עוֹלָם , from everlasting to everlasting thou art God.' 'I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.'
Ps. xc. 2.	
Rev. i. 8.	

As regards the idea of 'eternity' there ought to be no doubt. The notion of time, it is true, may not apply to a state in which time shall be no more, but permanent duration is an idea that does strictly apply to it; and it can matter nothing whether the eternity, expressed in Greek by *aiōnes*, and in Hebrew by עֲלָמִים, be defined, as that which has neither end nor beginning, or whether it be said to be a permanent, invariable, ceaseless state of existence, over which death, in the sense of annihilation, can have no power. But when we speak of the *duration* of eternity, a correct idea must be attached to the phrase. There is a duration that is continuous and relative; but its continuity is marked by the flux of time. This idea of course is inapplicable to eternity. And there is a duration that is permanent and substantive, and our only idea of it is, that it is life eternal; a state of being that is fixed and absolute, and admits of no notion of either termination or change. Defective appre-

ciation of this twofold idea of duration has led, in every age of the world, to imperfect reasonings respecting the idea of eternity. The sophism has recurred again and again, which may be syllogistically expressed as follows: 'All duration may be apportioned; but eternity cannot be apportioned; therefore eternity is not duration.' The parallogism is evident; eternity may not be continuous duration, such as we define by the temporal lapse of moments or of ages; but eternity is permanent duration, or substantive existence; and this is a positive idea, wholly applicable to the soul's relations with God, and to the Great Creator of the spirits of men Himself. It is false reasoning therefore to say, that 'the idea of eternal duration is unreal, because it is a mere negation,' consisting only of the absence of either beginning or end; for it is a positive state, a permanent condition of life, which may exclude indeed the idea of successional flow, but exists as a substantial and living reality, and is revealed to us as perfect joy or unmitigated misery, accordingly as certain spiritual obligations are satisfied or disregarded. If then it be said, that eternity is no mere negation of time, that it is a spiritual condition, for 'This is life eternal, to know thee the only God,' the reply is simply this; that very knowledge, to be perfect, involves a permanent and unchanging state of being, coexistent with each individual soul. It is a knowledge, not speculative but intuitive; not imperfect, but substantial; it is the perfect harmonising of the individual will with the will of God, and there-

Knowledge
of God.

The second
death

fore it is knowledge; the true perception of things eternal as they are, and the fruition of that consciousness without drawback or shadow of change. To know God is to know all that is holy and good and wise, to see Him as He is, awful in his perfection, unchangeable in attribute, unfailing in love; and such knowledge can be described to us by no other term than that it is, as unvarying in its subsistence as its Divine object: 'This is life eternal, to know thee the only God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.'

But it is the undoubted tendency of the present age of intellectual research, to treat things spiritual with the same daring license of speculation as is applied to the investigation of the physical world. Human reason is set up as the sufficient arbiter of things divine. No dread of irreverence now stays the hand from forming such non-scriptural schemes, as are thought to be most agreeable to a rational conception of the Divine Attributes, and then everything, not even excepting the Word of God, is bent to fit the narrow limits. So, because the idea of eternal duration cannot be realised, or reconciled in its entire results with that which man presumes respecting the Deity, it is rejected as unreal; the puny faculties of man being assumed to be the sufficient gauge of things that are not seen and eternal.

It has already been stated that the glories of the life eternal have been prepared before the world, only for those, in whom the will of God is recognised on earth, as the guide of action. Where the

warnings of the All-wise are rejected, and the corrupt will of man has been set up in its place ; where ignorance of God has been either the punishment of sin, or the judicial effect of wilfully closing the eyes to the light, the sentence has gone forth eternally, ‘ The soul that sinneth, it shall die ;’ and the condition of that death, is ‘ destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.’ But the second death involves no suspension of consciousness like the first ; it is a privation of the light and blessing of life, with a knowledge of its loss ; for it is impossible that we should have any reverence for the Word of Life, if we affix any other than their plain meaning to the Saviour’s words ; ‘ Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.’ There is the consciousness of corruption involved in those terrible words, a dwelling amid everlasting burnings, for which the guilty conscience eternally supplies the fuel. We may not trifle with words of such fearful import. The doctrine of the Creed does no more than faithfully reflect the warnings of Scripture ; and since it cannot be shewn that the terrors of the Lord, as described in the Word of God, are susceptible of any modification of meaning, so neither can the Church, as the witness and keeper of Holy Writ, be justified in affixing any other interpretation to the words of Scripture, than that which a plain and grammatical interpretation alone is found to warrant.

The finality of a future state of punishment, first suggested as a matter of speculative opinion by Origen, if translators may be believed, and re-

a state of
conscious-
ness.

2 Thess. i. 9.

οὐ τελευτᾷ.

Anabaptist
error.

vived about the time of the Reformation by the Anabaptists of Germany, is a favourite Socinian tenet at the present day¹. The Church however has always pointedly denied the anti-scriptural assertion. Whether Origen held the opinion or no, it was anathematised by the Church. The Anabaptist revival was also condemned in the Augsburg Confession, Art. xvii. ‘*Damnans Anabaptistas, qui sentiunt, hominibus damnatis ac diabolis, finem pœnarum futurum esse.*’ It has been attempted to establish, by inference, a connivance in the same heretical view on the part of the Church of England; because in the forty-second Article of King Edward VI., A.D. 1552, the Anabaptist notion had been condemned as at Augsburg; which Article was subsequently rescinded. ‘*Hi quoque damnatione digni sunt, qui conantur hodie perniciosam opinionem instaurare, quod omnes, quantumvis impii, servandi sunt tandem, cum, definito tempore a justitia divina, pœnas de admissis flagitiis luerunt.*’ The suppression of these words, A.D. 1562, is no proof of acquiescence in the misinterpretation of Scripture; but rather of a wise determination not

¹ Modern assertions of the same idea may be traced to the pages of the free thinker Hobbes. Only the determination of punishment with him consisted in a total extinction of the guilty soul. The modern resolution of a penal future we are yet to learn. The pains of the wicked, according to Hobbes, may be said to be eternal, because they shall be kept up ‘so long as the kind of man by propagation shall

endure, that is eternally;’ so that ‘there may never want wicked men to be tormented in them; though not every, nor any one eternally.’ *Leviathan*, 44. By one bold violation of Scripture truth, the necessity of continual misinterpretation is here evaded. As yet, at least, the notion of an eternal succession of the human race has not been revived in the Neology of the day.

to overload the formal statements of the Church with the negation of errors, that had no general currency in England. To condemn under such circumstances would only be to propagate error. The suppression of the Anabaptists in Germany by the rigorous measures that attended the taking of Munster, and the richly merited punishment of John of Leyden, caused a considerable body to migrate to England, A.D. 1535. A judicial enquiry into the tenets of this sect, A.D. 1549, shews that the forty-second Edwardian Article might have been demanded by the aspect of affairs in 1552; but nothing more is heard of the Anabaptists between this date and the promulgation of the Elizabethan Articles in 1562; for this reason we are justified in supposing, that the last Article of the preceding code was now cancelled, because it was no longer needed. Elsewhere, also, the republican tendencies of the Anabaptist sect were more formidable to the civil power, than its religious views were to the spiritual. Hence the retention of other Articles bearing upon Anabaptist political heterodoxy. It is also worthy of observation, that the rescinding of a portion of the third Article in 1562, is just as expressive of a belief in the unchanging nature of man's future condition, as the curtailment of the closing Article could be of the reverse; and if the Church of England in the course of ten years had so completely swerved round in her teaching, as to adopt tenets which she then condemned, the third Article would scarcely have omitted the passage, 'Spiritus ab illo emissus, cum

Articles;
A.D. 1552,
and 1562.

Compare p.
678.

Charity
believeth
all things,

spiritibus, qui in carcere sive inferno detinebantur, fuit, illisque prædicavit, quemadmodum testatur Petri locus.' But any how the inference drawn from this cancelled Article is not justified by the history of the time.

The material notion of a future state of punishment consisting of *mere bodily* torment, no one perhaps would care to maintain; but the endless punishment that awaits the *soul* that perishes in sin, is an idea that cannot be discarded, so long as we reverence the Bible; it is confounded however with the material deductions of an age of superstition; and being treated in the same way, it is either discredited or denied. Nay, the plainest statements of Scripture, too direct to be explained away, but too explicit for the world's comfort, are treated as though the sacred writers knew not their own mind; 'understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm¹.' A far more pious course is it, to leave the deep things of God to Him, of whose mercy and love we can or ought to have no doubt. Temporal evil we have learned to refer to that love, without any misgiving or after-thought of unbelief; and who shall dare to say, that a firm faith in the truth of all that Scripture affirms with respect to eternal evil, is inconsistent

1 Tim. i. 7.

¹ In a recent volume of 'Theological Essays,' we find the reckless statement: 'This it is, of which our Lord must have spoken in his last prayer, if he who reports that prayer did not misinterpret his meaning.' If such words are ever misunderstood to convey an expres-

sion of the writer's own view of St John's inspiration, the fault must be with himself. In any case such language is strangely inconsistent with the more than usually sacred character of the scripture to which appeal is made.

with the perfect attributes of God? To the believing soul God manifests himself as eternal love; and the more firmly the soul is built up in that love, the more awful will be its sense of the judicial terms of Scripture, in describing the punishment of the wicked; yet, at the same time, a consciousness of our own blindness will, as it should, prevent any rash doubt of what the word of God hath spoken; ‘There is mercy with thee, therefore shalt thou be feared,’ is a truth not only of a temporal character, but pregnant also with eternal meaning; and however an intellectual age may doubt and cavil and deny, still the pious mind will lay to heart the Saviour’s rebuke of ambitious speculation, ‘What is that to thee? follow thou me.’

hopeth all
things.

It is with a firm faith in God’s goodness that his Church accepts, in its plain and literal sense, whatever He hath spoken concerning the life everlasting; and it is with no other feeling that she has adopted the statements of this Creed; not pretending to reconcile its words with that which man weakly conceives of the Divine Attributes; and not daring to suppress the terrible judgment of God against wilful sin and unbelief.

45 HÆC EST FIDES CATHOLICA, QUAM NISI QUI-
QUE FIDELITER, FIRMITERQUE CREDIDERIT, SALVUS ESSE
NON POTERIT.

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE TEXTS.

Genesis :	PAGE	1 Samuel :	PAGE
i. 1—3	160—163	xxx. 12, 13	370
i. 2	424	1 Kings :	
ii. 1	154	xix. 16	172
ii. 4	141	1 Chron. :	
iii. 10	115	xx. 17	168
iii. 15	173, 178	xxix. 11, 12	154
vi. 3	465	Nehemiah :	
x. 24, 25	203	ix. 6	154
x. 30	204	Job :	
xiv. 18	201	i. 6	141
xxiv. 43	282	xxxviii. 7	141
xxv. 2	200	Psalms :	
xxviii. 16	172	ii. 2	367
xliv. 10	180	ii. 7	476
Exodus :		xvii. 5	365
ii. 8	282	xix. 5—9	91
iii. 14	149	xxxiii. 6	154
xiv. 13	168	xxxvi. 10	232
xviii. 10—12. 19—26	201	xl. 12	303
xxiii. 16	251	xl. 3	179
xxiv. 5	200	xl. 7	291
xxviii. 41, &c.	172	lv. 4, 5	303
xxx. 32	190	lxi. 7	176
Leviticus :		lxviii. 5	142
xxiii. 10, 11	375	lxviii. 18	386, 388
xxiii. 40, 42	251	lxviii. 25	282
Numbers :		lxxiii. 3—17	406
xxiv. 7, 17	177	lxxiii. 3	535
Deuteronomy :		lxxxvi. 4	663
iv. 2	585	xcvi. 13	531
vi. 4	123	cx. 4	200
viii. 5	143	cxviii. 22, 23	257
xvi. 13	251	cxviii. 26	255
Judges :		Proverbs :	
viii. 18	259	i. 6	283
Ruth :		iii. 11, 12	143
iv. 30	189	viii. 15, 16	154

Proverbs :	PAGE
viii. 27—30	238
xxx. 18—20	283
Song of Solomon :	
i. 3	283
vi. 8	282
vii. 13	177
Isaiah :	
i. 2	158
vi. 1—3, 10	246, 260
vii. 6	278—284
vii. 14	173
ix. 6	174, 175
xi. 1	178
xvi. 1	177
xl. 3—5	269
xl. 12	154
lii. 14	259
liii. 5	310
liii. 5—8	319
liii. 9	326
lxi. 1, 2	192
lxi. 11	274
Jeremiah :	
xxiii. 5	181, 268
xxxi. 15	223
Lamentations :	
iv. 20	608
Ezekiel :	
xxi. 9, 10	211, 310
Daniel :	
ii. 21	155
vii. 10—14	415
viii. 14	370
xi. 31	311
Amos :	
iii. 8	465
Jonah :	
i. 17	371
Micah :	
iv. 8	183
v. 2	181, 188
vi. 8	408
Zechariah :	
iv. 7	175
vi. 11	271
vi. 12	179
ix. 9	176, 184

Malachiah :	PAGE
iv. 5	184
2 Maccabees :	
vii. 9	350
vii. 14	536
St Matthew :	
i. 21	165
ii. 3	222
iii. 17	424
v. 43—45	145, 289
vi. 26—32	142
xi. 27	137
xii. 23	189
xii. 31, 32	432
xii. 37	409
xii. 40	369
xvi. 18	483
xvi. 21—23	300
xvi. 27	413
xvii. 1	252
xx. 18, 19	300
xxi. 12, 13, 42	257, 287
xxii. 7	314
xxii. 15, 17	224
xxii. 31, 32	349
xxii. 42	189, 396
xxiii. 13	288
xxiii. 39	257
xxv. 41	539
xxvi. 17	328
xxvi. 38, 39	302
xxvi. 56	352
xxvi. 62	369
xxvi. 63	240, 321
xxvi. 65	305
xxvii. 54	312, 321
xxviii. 19	426
St Mark :	
vi. 34	291
ix. 44	539
xii. 14, 17, 28, 35—37	266
xvi. 3, 4	354
xvi. 16	490
St Luke :	
i. 17	270
i. 26	238
i. 31	163
i. 32	276
i. 35	274

St Luke:	PAGE	St John :	PAGE
i. 47	167	vi. 63	445
ii. 1	189	vi. 69	240
ii. 11	271	vii. 37, 38	254
ii. 35	313	vii. 42	187
ii. 49	237	viii. 24, 25	241
iii. 38	141	viii. 26—29	137, 138, 299
iv. 14, 18	192	viii. 28	321, 395
vi. 46	415	viii. 51—59	242
ix. 25	532	ix. 29	187
x. 21	292	ix. 41	432
x. 22	137	x. 24	256
xi. 52	288	x. 30	260
xii. 50	302	xi. 5, 25, 26, 33, 36	290
xiii. 32, 33	287	xi. 27	240
xvi. 20	538	xi. 50	303
xviii. 19	153	xii. 13, 14	256
xix. 37	188	xii. 27, 32—34	299, 306, 307
xxii. 69	395	xii. 41	246
xxiii. 1—3	224	xii. 42, 43	198
xxiii. 34, 46	313, 321, 484	xii. 49	429, 430
xxiii. 43	538	xiii. 31, 32	291
xxiv. 1, 3—8	354	xiii. 34, 35	289
xxiv. 27, 45—47	16, 208	xiv. 1—3	122, 394
xxiv. 30	219	xiv. 18	430
xxiv. 39, 42	529	xiv. 26	425, 430, 447
xxiv. 49	384	xv. 8	462
xxiv. 50	217	xv. 9—14	288
St John :		xv. 26	425, 429, 447
i. 6, 33, 34	238, 269, 321	xvi. 7, 16	430
i. 9	193	xvi. 14	452
i. 13	316	xvii. 4	462
i. 14	252	xvii. 11, 21, 22	475
i. 18	417	xvii. 21, 23	515, 623
ii. 17	287	xviii. 11	299
ii. 19, 21	351	xviii. 14	303
iii. 5, 8, 11	244, 491	xviii. 19	260
iii. 6	274	xviii. 28	328
iii. 13	243, 386, 391	xviii. 31	306
iii. 14	299	xviii. 36	307
v. 17, 18, 33	241	xviii. 37	224
v. 19	137, 237, 260, 423	xix. 7	305
v. 23	138, 432	xix. 7—9	307
v. 26, 30	136, 260, 411	xix. 14	328
v. 35	193	xix. 26, 27	290, 529
vi. 38	411	xix. 28	318
vi. 40, 56—58	244	xix. 31	374
vi. 53	491	xix. 35	320
vi. 62	243, 386	xx. 7, 11—18	355

St John:	PAGE	1 Corinthians :	PAGE
xx. 17	530	ii. 10, 11	465
xx. 19	352	ii. 16	194
xx. 21	493	iii. 11... ..	505
xx. 22	448	iii. 16... ..	517
xx. 27	529	v. 5.....	500
xx. 28	264	v. 7.....	374
Acts:		vi. 11	514
i. 4.....	384	vi. 17	492, 517
i. 11	418	vi. 19	445
i. 21, 22	11	vi. 19, 20	518
ii. 24—27	365	vi. 20.....	263, 461
ii. 27	344	viii. 6.....	122, 134, 264
ii. 42	486	ix. 1	12
iv. 32	59	x. 4	483
iv. 35	437	xii. 4—11	433—436, 464
v. 2.....	437	xii. 12.....	470
vi. 7	359	xii. 27... ..	471
vii. 51—59	21, 464	xiii. 10	474
viii. 19, 20.....	438	xv. 8, 14, 15	12
viii. 37	427	xv. 20, 23.....	375
x. 38	173	xv. 24, 25, 28	274, 421
xiii. 4.....	436	xv. 28	156, 422, 591
xiv. 15—17.....	92	xv. 32	537
xvii. 24—28	92	xv. 37—49.....	526
xix. 5	427	2 Corinthians :	
xx. 28.....	263, 297	i. 21	195
xxiv. 14	123	iii. 6, 17.....	445, 516
xxvi. 6	123	iii. 15, 18	446, 462
xxvi. 26	309	iv. 17	143
Romans:		v. 4.....	251
i. 4.....	512	v. 20	519
i. 19—22	92	vi. 16	517
ii. 14, 15	114, 409	x. 5.....	273, 412
iii. 23	462	Galatians:	
iii. 30.....	484	i. 9	588
v. 10	513, 519	i. 11—19	14
vi. 3, 7, 17, 18 ...30, 31, 316,	428	iii. 27	490
vi. 4	366	v. 17	517
vi. 5, 6	316	vi. 14	516
viii. 11	366, 445, 522	Ephesians:	
viii. 16	505, 518	i. 3	217
viii. 26—29	463	i. 5	342
viii. 28—30	477	i. 12	461
xiii. 1.....	155	i. 17, 20—22.....	272, 397
xiv. 5, 6.....	383	i. 23	470
1 Corinthians:		ii. 5, 6	317, 522
i. 24, 30.....	248	ii. 22	517
ii. 7	469	iii. 9—11	469

	PAGE		PAGE
Ephesians :		Hebrews :	
iv. 5	122	vi. 4	32
iv. 7—12	342, 386, 470	vi. 6	23, 500
iv. 15, 16	471	vii. 3, 7	202
iv. 18—22	387	vii. 14, 21	200
v. 23, 30	474	ix. 7, 12, 24	385
Philippians :		x. 12	392, 403
i. 11	461	xi. 4	480
ii. 5—8	259	xii. 2	291
ii. 8—11	272, 394, 397	xii. 9, 10	143, 144
Colossians :		xii. 22—24	317
i. 16	158	1 Peter :	
ii. 12	317, 366, 428	i. 11	245
ii. 14	315	i. 19	298
ii. 15	341, 352	iii. 8—17	339
ii. 17	478	iii. 18—20	245, 338, 445, 466
ii. 18, 19	472	iii. 21, 22	32, 394, 428
iii. 1	317	iv. 1—7	339
1 Thessalonians :		iv. 13	316
iv. 15—17	419	iv. 14	462
2 Thessalonians :		2 Peter :	
ii. 4	432	i. 14	252
1 Timothy :		i. 21	464, 465
i. 2	29	iii. 4	406
i. 14	28	1 John :	
i. 20	588	i. 7	263
iii. 16	262	ii. 2	513
vi. 13, 15, 16	322	ii. 20, 27	195
vi. 20	27	iii. 1—3	145
2 Timothy :		iii. 16	289
i. 10	537	v. 1, 12	490
ii. 17, 18	28, 588	v. 8	320
Titus :		Jude :	
iii. 5—8	30	3	32
Hebrews :		14	415
i. 2—4	250, 392	Revelation :	
i. 3	232	i. 7	417
i. 6, 8	458	i. 8, 11, 17, 18	249
ii. 1	493	xiii. 8	299, 476
iii. 5	170	xxii. 20	535
iv. 11	170		

BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

ECCLESIE ANGLICANÆ

VINDEK KATHOLICUS

SIVE

ARTICULORUM ECCLESIE ANGLICANÆ CUM SCRIPTIS SS. PATRUM NOVA COLLATIO.

In which the following Documents of Christian Antiquity, in the original languages, are arranged according to the Subjects of the Thirty-nine Articles.

Ælfrici Abbatis Hom. de Baptismo, *Saxonice. Jam primum in lucem edita.*

..... in S. Pascha, *Saxonice.*

S. Ambrosii Liber de Mysteriis.

S. Amphilochii Ep. Synodalis de S. Spiritu.

S. Athanasii Tomus ad Antiochenos.

..... Orationis II. c. Arianos, cap. 72—82.

..... Epistola ad Epictetum.

..... Epistolæ Festalis Fragmentum.

..... Expositio Fidei.

..... Libri duo de Incarnatione c. Apollinarium.

S. Aurelii Augustini Epistolæ ad Asellicum, Bonifacium, Consentium, Evodium, Hilarium, Januarium, Paulinum.

..... Enarratio II. in Ps. xxxi.

..... Sermo clviii.

..... Tractatus xxvi. in Evang. sec. S. Joh.

..... Libri duo priores de Trinitate.

..... Lib. II. c. Ep. Parmeniani.

..... Libri duo priores de Pecc. Mer. et Remiss.

..... Lib. de Gratia et Lib. Arb.

S. Basilii M. Lib. de Spiritu Sancto.

..... Or. de Humilitate.

Præfatio in Libros Carolinos.

S. Joh. Chrysostomi Ep. ad Cæsarium.

..... Hom. Postquam Presb. Gothus, &c.

..... Hom. ix. de Pœnitentia.

..... Hom. de Prod. Judæ.

- S. Clementis Rom. Ep. ad Corinthios.
 Clementis Al. Pædag. III. 6. Strom. VIII. 8.
 Concil. Nicæni, CPtani, Ephesini, et Chalcedonensis, Canones et
 Epistolæ.
 Africani Ep. ad Cælestinum Pap. R.
 Antioch. Ep. de Paulo Samosatensi.
 Arausicani II. et Laodicensi Canones.
 Milevitani Canon. XXII.
 S. Cæc. Cypriani Epistolæ ad Cæcilium, Fidum, Jubaianum, Mag-
 num, Martyres, Pompeium, Stephanum.
 Libr. de Lapsis; de Mortalitate; de Oratione
 Dom.; de Unitate Ecclesiæ.
 Præf. in Sententias Episcoporum Carthagini Con-
 vocatorum.
 S. Cyrilli Hieros. Catech. v. XI.
 Catech. Mystagog. I. II. IV. V.
 S. Cyrilli Alex. Ep. ad Nestorium; Synodica; ad Joh. Antioch.
 Hom. Paschales XIX. XXIV. XXX.
 Hom. in Mysticam Cœnam.
 S. Ephremi Syri Paræn. II. *Syriace*.
 Eusebii Pamph. Ep. ad Cæsarienses.
 Capita tria priora Demonstrationis Evang. olim
 deperdita.
 de Vita Constantini III. 4—14.
 Fragmenta S. Irenæi, Caii, Melitonis, Gelasii I.
 Ven. Fortunati Expositio Fidei Catholicæ.
 S. Fulgentii Lib. III. ad Thrasim. Regem.
 S. Gregorii Naz. Or. XXIX.
 S. Gregorii M. Ep. ad Eulogium et Anastasium.
 S. Hieronymi Ep. ad Paulinum.
 Præf. in Libr. Salomonis.
 S. Hilarii Lib. II. de Trinitate.
 Hilarii Ep. ad S. Augustinum.
 ex Historicis Excerpta,
 Euseb. de Vit. Const. III. 4—14.
 Evagrii H. E. I. 3—6.
 Socratis H. E. I. 11. v. 8.
 S. Hosii Conf. Ep. ad Constantium Aug.
 Hymnus Matutinus Græcorum.
 S. Ignatii Epistolæ VII. ad Eph., Magnes., Trall. &c. ad fidem lit.
 Græc.
 S. Irenæi adv. Hær. I. 2, 3. III. 1—4. IV. 34. 38. 70—72. V. 1, 2.

- S. Justini M. Apol. i. 61—71.
 In Appendice, Rescripta Adriani, Antonini Pii, M.
 Aurelii, Trajani, Marciani.
 Epistola ad Diognetum.
 S. Leonis M. Ep. ad Flavianum.
 S. Macarii Æg. Hom. xlv.
 Maximi Opusc. de duabus Naturis.
 Origenis Proœm. ad Lib. i. π. ἀρχῶν.
 S. Paciani Epistolæ tres ad Sympronianum.
 S. Paulini Nol. Ep. de Gazophylacio.
 C. Plinii Sec. Ep. ad Trajanum Imp.
 S. Polycarpi Ep. ad Philippenses.
 Martyrium.
 S. Prosperi Ep. ad S. Augustinum.
 Regula Fidei apud S. Irenæum, Tertullianum, Greg. Thaum.,
 Lucian., Constit. Apostol. &c. &c.
 Ruffini Expos. Symboli Aquileiensis.
 Symbolorum Collectio.
 Tertullianus de Præscr. Hæreticorum.
 Theodreti Lib. vi. de Var. Prop.
-

IN COMPLIANCE WITH CURRENT
COPYRIGHT LAW
OCKER & TRAPP, INC.
AND
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRODUCED THIS REPLACEMENT VOLUME
ON WEYERHAEUSER COUGAR OPAQUE NATURAL PAPER,
THAT MEETS ANSI/NISO STANDARDS Z39.48-1992
TO REPLACE THE IRREPARABLY
DETERIORATED ORIGINAL. 1997



1 1012 01131 0606

DEC 12 2008		
GAYLORD		PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

